

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, November 13, 1995

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. CLINGER].

## DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
November 13, 1995.

I hereby designate the Honorable WILLIAM F. CLINGER, Jr., to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

## SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Tim Sanders, one of his secretaries.

## MORNING BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 1995, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties with each party limited to 30 minutes and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders limited to 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] for 5 minutes.

## GROSS MISMANAGEMENT OF CONGRESSIONAL SCHEDULE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, America is aware of the fact that if Congress does not take immediate action at midnight tonight, the Federal Government will shut down. How did we reach this point?

First, we have seen gross mismanagement of the congressional schedule this year in the House of Representatives. In the first 100 days with the so-called Contract With America, Speaker GINGRICH and the Republicans insisted on considering 31 bills on an emergency basis, many of them without committee hearing. As a result of 100 days of action and activity on the floor of the House, 31 different bills were called; 3 have been signed into law.

Because of our dedication of time to that Contract With America, we have

fallen behind in our responsibility to pass appropriation bills. The budget resolution was a month late; the appropriations bills which keep the Government running were supposed to be presented, all 13 of them, to the President by October 1—2, 2 of the 13 have made it.

So now we are considering what we call a continuing resolution, a spending bill to keep us in business, and along comes the Republican leadership and Mr. GINGRICH, and instead of sending a bill to the President just to keep the Government running while we do the rest of our business on Capitol Hill, he insists on this paragraph.

This is the reason the Government is shutting down. Mr. GINGRICH insists that in order to keep the Government running, he wants to include these nine lines, which increase Medicare premiums on senior citizens as of January 1 by 25 percent. What does this have to do with keeping the Government running? Little or nothing. But it is part of the political egoism which we are seeing as part of this crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I have a solution to this problem and the solution is very simple. It is H.R. 2281. It does not even take up two pages. It is a bill I introduced in the House and Senator BARBARA BOXER introduced into the Senate. It is very simple. It simply states, no budget, no pay.

It basically says to Members of Congress, if you cannot keep Government in operation, if you want America to default on its national debt, why should you be paid? You have failed in your responsibility as Members of Congress elected to this body. How can the train crew that caused the train wreck ask to be paid while the passengers are suffering? How can Speaker GINGRICH and Members of Congress send 800,000 Federal employees home tomorrow without pay and continue to draw their own paychecks?

The failure of the Republican leadership to pass appropriations bills required by law or to produce an honest continuing resolution is a complete abdication of responsibility. Penalizing Federal employees and the American people by shutting down the Government is a shameful political ego trip. If the Government shuts down, so should congressional paychecks.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will be following the provisions of H.R. 2281: no budget, no pay. I will be returning my pay while the Government is shut down.

Perhaps if Speaker GINGRICH and his leaders tasted the bitter medicine of a

government shutdown personally, they might be willing to help this country get well.

I urge every one of my colleagues and every American who is sick and tired of this political gamesmanship to call Speaker NEWT GINGRICH in Washington and demand that no budget, no pay, H.R. 2281 be voted on on an emergency basis. Senator BARBARA BOXER and I are joining in a letter to the Speaker today to urge that this be brought before the House.

We are going to spend the whole day on a series of suspension bills which are unimportant. They are innocuous and unnecessary. We ought to bring up no budget, no pay, and perhaps avert this Government crisis.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for some of the Republican leaders in Congress to put their money where their over-active political mouths have been.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind all persons in the gallery that they are guests of the House of Representatives, and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is a violation of the Rules of the House.

## NEGOTIATING TOWARD A BALANCED BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I also want to talk about the budget disagreement that is going on today and my views are a little bit different than the gentleman from Illinois who just spoke.

First of all, I want to point out that this is a very complex matter because, to begin with, we are considering two different bills. One bill would keep the Government authorized to spend money; that is, in a continuing resolution. I might add that a use of a continuing resolution has been done many times in the past by the Democratic Party when they were the majority in Congress. There is nothing new about it, nothing in the Constitution that says a continuing resolution cannot be used in place of an appropriations bill.

Further, we are considering a separate bill that would continue the Government's ability to borrow money

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

since both the ability to spend more and the ability to borrow more are necessary to keep the Government operating. It is the ability to spend more, however, that has its effect at midnight tonight if we do not take some action.

Now, the Congress has passed, or is about to pass, a bill on each, to continue spending and to continue the Government's ability to borrow. The President has vetoed one bill and has threatened to veto the other bill, and what I want to examine is why? What are the differences here?

The President has asked for what he calls clean bills. Clean bills means no other conditions except an unlimited, for the time given, ability to spend money and an unlimited ability to continue to borrow money. I think that would be a bad policy. I do not blame the President for asking for it, but I think it would be a bad policy for the Government, because an unrestricted ability of the Government to borrow money and an unrestricted ability of the Government to spend money is exactly how we got into this mess in the first place and why our national debt is almost \$5 trillion for our children and grandchildren to pay off.

Further, the idea of conditions on these kinds of bills are not new. The Graham-Rudman-Hollings bill was attached to an increase in the debt ceiling back in 1985.

Now, what really needs to happen is for the two sides, the administration and the leadership of Congress, to negotiate their differences, as long as they are both negotiating toward a balanced budget. That is the ultimate goal here, and both sides have declared in general that they agree with that goal.

Now, in my opinion, with respect to the administration and with respect to my own Republican leadership, I think that both sides need to focus on that goal of balancing the budget and to stop trying to score short-term advantages in the polls against each other, and I think to some extent both sides have been doing that.

Let me take the congressional side first. In the bills that are going to the President, the Republican leadership has included provisions which have absolutely nothing to do with a balanced budget. We remove some similar provisions in the process. But there are provisions that would deal with regulatory reform, that would deal with the death penalty that are included in these bills.

Without questioning whether these are good ideas or bad ideas, I think that they are separate ideas. I think issues dealing with regulatory reform and issues dealing with the death penalty should be considered separately, and that the goal should be to balance the budget and any conditions attached should deal with balancing the budget and nothing else.

At the same time, I think the administration has not offered to negotiate

in good faith as of this time. The Republican leadership, to its credit, has not insisted on any provision to be adopted other than the goal of balancing the budget.

So I have heard from Democratic Party advocates saying that the Government and the President are being held hostage. Not true. The Republican leadership has not insisted, in advance, that any of its individual provisions must be accepted in any negotiation, whether it is these provisions that do not deal with the budget or provisions that do.

The Republican leadership has said, we will negotiate anything, as long as the goal is balancing the budget. It is the administration that has set a precondition to negotiate. Specifically, the administration has said that it will not negotiate toward a balanced budget unless, in advance, the Republicans drop their Medicare provision.

Before examining that provision, I want to emphasize that I think it is not good faith to say, before we negotiate, here is what you have to give up, and I do not care whether the provision deals with Medicare or anything else. I think just as the Republicans think some of their nonbudget items will give them a better standing in the polls because they are popular items, the administration believes, if you fight for Medicare, you are going to be more popular short-term in the polls also.

Well, let me examine further what exactly is the Medicare provision that the administration is standing on. Medicare is divided into two parts. Part A pays for hospital bills; it is funded by a payroll tax. Part B pays for physicians and other services.

Part B premiums for Medicare are scheduled to go up for the Treasury from 68.5 to 75 percent. That will happen January 1. That is the whole issue that the administration says we are willing to risk closing down the Government to preserve. The Republicans propose keeping the percentage the same.

#### LET US BRING A DEAL TO THE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FORD] is recognized during morning business for 2 minutes.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I too want to rise and say that the American people are very much concerned about what is going on and why the Government might have to shut down at 12 o'clock tonight, less than 12 hours from now.

It is clear, Mr. Speaker, that we as legislators here in this Congress ought to be about the business of maintaining this Government. We have heard speakers before talking about well, why is it that we cannot come to some type of

agreement with the administration from the Congress?

I say it is now 12:40 p.m. here in the Nation's Capitol, and I do not know where the Speaker is right now, but we ought to be about the business, since the President has vetoed these two measures, in making sure that we send a clean CR to the President, because we do not need these things in the debt ceiling and in the CR to make sure that the Government would operate and run smoothly until such time that the reconciliation is worked out among the conferees and we send the President a real deal to his desk.

We have gone through the budget process. The Republican leadership is now some 6 weeks behind with the budget. They were due in by September 30, and when we cannot complete our business, yes, we send a CR to the President. Why is it that we are sending to the President this increase in the Medicare premiums when we have the Medicare bill and the reconciliation budget that is going to go to the President soon?

It is our responsibility to say to the American people and to the markets that this Government will not shut down and the Speaker ought to make his way back to the House of Representatives and let us send something to the President in a CR and a debt limit, so that we can have the Government in operation at midnight tonight and Federal employees on their job and doing their jobs tomorrow.

It is the intent of this House, at least the Democrats of this House, to send something to the President that he will sign and something that will keep this Government open and not costing the taxpayers additional dollars because of the irresponsibility of the leadership of this House.

□ 1245

#### GETTING ON WITH THE BUSINESS OF GOVERNING

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CLINGER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I am as frustrated as any Member, I think, on either side of the aisle with the impasse we are currently facing between the President and the congressional leadership.

They have an old saying that when the elephants fight, the grass gets trampled. In this case, the people getting trampled are your Federal employees who have been out there every day doing the job that the President and the Congress have asked them to do. In no way should they be the ones to pay the price just because we in the Congress and the President cannot get



our act together and get on with the business of governing.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] talked earlier about H.R. 2281, his No Budget, No Pay Act. I will join him in turning away any pay that I would ordinarily receive until Federal employees get paid as well. I think that is the example all of us in this body ought to take until we can get on with the job of governing this country.

I would also like to address a couple of remarks that came from the other side about gross mismanagement of the congressional schedule and try to put it in some kind of perspective. Since 1977 over 57 continuing resolutions have passed this body and gone on to the President. This will be the 10th time since 1980 that we have faced a shutdown and possible furloughs at the Federal level. The other side of the aisle has not been clean in attaching riders to continuing resolutions as well. So there is some precedent for where we are today. But the real issue is how do we get out of it. How do we work it out today so employees can get back to work and go on with the business of governing this country?

I have a letter from the Speaker and the majority leader in the Senate giving their assurances to myself, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA], and the entire body that the Federal employees will get paid in a later resolution should there be furloughs following the President's inability to sign this current continuing resolution. We have never before had that agreement up front from the congressional side. However, the payments could be delayed. But Federal employees will get paid.

I would urge both sides to put aside their egos, to check their macho images and get on with the business of governing at this point, to step back a little bit, take a deep breath and recognize what we face as a country over the next month as we work toward a balanced budget.

There are clearly differences on both sides of the aisle over the best way to achieve balancing the Federal budget over a 7-year period. But over 90 Members of the other side of the aisle and virtually everyone on this side of the aisle has agreed that this is the direction this country needs to move.

The President himself when he was campaigning for election in 1992 said that he would balance the Federal budget in 5 years. Now the issue is doing it in 7 years and trying to get it scored properly by the Congressional Budget Office.

What should be the extent of the tax cuts? The President has his set, Congress has theirs. That ought to be negotiated. I do not think we ought to draw lines in the sand on that.

What programs should be cut? There are honest differences of opinion and

we need to sit across the table from each other and work these differences out. At the same time balancing the Federal budget remains paramount.

We spend a significant amount of money in this country on interest on the national debt. In 1997 we will be spending more money for interest on the national debt than for all of national defense. My 13-year-old son can expect to pay over his lifetime about \$130,000 in extra Federal taxes just to pay for interest on the national debt if he makes an average salary.

How we get there, I think, has to be negotiable. The sooner we sit down and agree, the better. We can put a continuing resolution and a temporary budget ceiling in place if we can get the President's agreement to sit down and negotiate clearly that we just try to do this within 7 years.

The 1996 campaign is going to come soon enough. Let us set aside the campaign for now. Instead of campaigning as many of us have over the last year, let us start governing for a little bit of time. The American people made a choice in 1992 to elect a Democratic President and they made a choice in 1994 to elect a Republican Congress.

It is incumbent upon both of us, both sides, to act like grownups and get on and work with each other to get the job done. Let both sides negotiate their differences out and get on with the business of governing. That is my counsel today.

#### IN SEARCH OF LIBERTY AND JUSTICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, more than three decades ago, the Democratic Congress pushed through historic legislation, and the Medicare Program was created.

At about the same time—more than three decades ago—the Republican nominee for President of the United States, uttered words that guided his party then and that seem to guide his party now.

He said, "Extremism in the defense of liberty is no vice. And moderation in the pursuit of justice is no virtue."

Barry Goldwater was as sincere then as Speaker GINGRICH is now.

The American people rejected the politics of extremism then, and the American people are rejecting the politics of extremism now.

The American people demanded moderation then, and the American people are demanding moderation now.

But, what is liberty? And, what is justice?

Liberty is freedom from arbitrary or despotic control. Liberty is the positive enjoyment of various social, polit-

ical, or economic rights and privileges. Liberty is the power of choice. Liberty is freedom.

Justice, on the other hand, is the quality of being just, impartial, or fair. Justice is the principle or ideal of just dealing or right action. Justice is conformity to truth, fact, or reason. Justice is righteousness.

There is no liberty in cutting school lunches for 2 million children, shutting off heating assistance for 2 million senior citizens, eliminating 100,000 scholarships and cutting loans for college students, eliminating summer jobs for 1.2 million high school students, and denying baby formula to thousands of infants.

Those actions are extreme. There is vice in those deeds.

There is no justice in cutting farm programs, and hurting small family farmers, in defunding pensions for which citizens have labored for life, and in taxing those who earn \$28,000 a year or less to give big business a free tax ride. There is no justice when the wealthy get tax relief, while working Americans get no relief. There is no justice when Medicare is cut by \$270 billion in order to give tax care of \$245 billion to the wealthy.

Those actions are not moderate. There is no virtue in those deeds.

In 1965, President Lyndon B. Johnson undertook a 100 day legislative agenda, that resulted in—passage of the Medicare bill—passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—and passage of the 1965 Voting Rights Act, which paved the way for many new voters to participate in record numbers.

In 1995, the new thinkers have been determined to change the pattern that Government has followed for more than a half century.

But, what has changed as a result of the Contract With America? What has been done to reinforce families? What has been done to restore the American dream? What has been done to take back our streets? Who has been helped?

In the first 100 days of 1995, they passed a bill that allows expatriate billionaires to avoid tax liability by renouncing their citizenship.

But, they have not enacted most of the appropriation bills. They have not enacted a viable budget reconciliation bill, nor a viable debt extension bill.

The Government is on the brink of closing down tonight. That is extreme. That is vice. There is no moderation in that possibility. There is no virtue in that position.

Again, I pointed out to my colleagues, that as we do our work, we must remember that our first responsibility is not to the parties to which we belong, but to the people we represent.

There are problems which we face that transcend party and politics. Teenage pregnancies stifle an entire community. Violence of any kind,

whether driven by drugs or propelled by deep philosophical differences, cannot and must not be tolerated. Economic justice must ring true for everyone.

Quality education is essential in every region of this great country.

Family reinforcement and restoration of the American dream must include all families, not just those with lots of money. And, we must consider our young and our senior citizens. From the sunrise of life to its sunset, Americans should feel safe and secure and well served by this Congress.

No party or person has an exclusive on such things as family values and personal responsibility. Those are standards we all absolutely hold dear.

Mr. Speaker, on Saturday the Nation honored our veterans.

Veterans perhaps more than any other Americans know of the defense of liberty, and the pursuit of justice.

Just a few days ago, the life of a veteran from another nation was taken by some who are extreme, some who would not moderate their views.

Unsuspecting Americans fell in Oklahoma because there were some who were extreme, some who would not moderate their views.

Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues, let us continue to honor our veterans by seeking liberty and justice for all Americans.

Let us lower our voices.

Let us tone down our tempers.

Let us do what is right.

Let us pass a clean continuing resolution and a clean debt ceiling bill so that America moves forward.

#### ONE PEOPLE, ONE LANGUAGE, ONE NATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, when I first introduced my legislation to make English our official language, the American people were most supportive, and today we have overwhelming support for this legislation. Only those who are ripping off the government programs like bilingual education and the cultural elitists were and are opposed.

These same critics were silenced 2 weeks ago when the entire world received an object lesson in the importance of a common language in preserving a nation and its common purpose. Just a short time ago, we almost witnessed the end of a nation. Our great friend and neighbor to the north, Canada, just narrowly avoided splitting in two over linguistic and cultural differences.

Canada may yet split up. The linguistic tensions in Canada were not eased by their razor-thin victory for unity. In

fact, the Canadian people face their greatest challenges in the months and years ahead, i.e., to weave a common thread of unity through an increasingly divided Nation.

Canada's example is a cautionary tale for our country, the most diverse Nation in the history of the world. Their narrow brush with breakup should sound a clarion call to all Americans who dismiss the importance of a common language and culture to a nation.

Here in America we have been given a precious and unique gift. We have been given this gift, a common language. One of this century's greatest statesmen, Winston Churchill, instinctively understood language's paramount importance in keeping a Nation together. He remarked that "the gift of a common language is a priceless inheritance" to a nation. America has truly been blessed in a way that our Canadian neighbor has not.

Around the world, nations have come to realize how right Churchill was. India, faced with a tangle of 14 languages and dialects spoken on their soil, turned to English to unite their diverse peoples. Eighty-eight countries have constitutional language provisions.

I participated in an international conference at the Sorbonne in Paris last March where national language policies were being considered in many European and South American countries.

Here in America, opinion polls show overwhelming support for official English language among the American people. In one recent survey, more than 11,000 people were polled, and 94 percent came out in favor of official English for the United States.

Let the cultural elitists say what they will, but the American people have spoken. They know from plain common sense that we need one language to keep this United States from breaking up into little Quebecs.

The recent events in Canada demonstrate that this issue is not an American or even a North American preoccupation. Nations all over the world are looking to language legislation to tame the centrifugal forces of ethnic and linguistic nationalism.

I do not want to watch the United States unravel the way Canada almost did. I have introduced legislation that seeks to reinforce the common bond that holds our country together, the English language. I hope that you will heed the warning signs and join me in the effort to keep America one Nation, one people, and for that we need one common language.

My friends, the old adage says that actions have consequences. It is equally true that inaction also has consequences. Canada's narrow brush with national divorce showed us what is possible when a Nation does not nurture and protect its national unity.

Let us not make the same mistake. Let us not be guilty of inaction when decisive efforts to preserve our common bond are needed. Let us make English our official language. Help me to do that by cosponsoring H.R. 739, and let us keep the United States the United States. For that, we need one people, one language, one Nation.

□ 1300

#### NOT A GOOD TIME FOR OUR COUNTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CLINGER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, well, this is, indeed, I think, a very sad day.

Let us put the facts down since we all speak one language. It is now more than 45 days after the fiscal year ran out, 45 days, and 89 percent of the budget that we were supposed to have done 45 days ago still has not been done. So here we are.

We cannot get an extension of an emergency measure to keep that 89 percent of the Government going while we work those details out. Most of the fights on this 89 percent are not between Republicans and Democrats. It is between Members of this body and Members of the other body on the other side of the aisle. So they are having this intraparty fight, and everybody else is paying a price.

You are going to have people say, oh, there have been these things before. There has never been one after 45 days with 89 percent of the budget still hanging out there, and the real issue here is trying to jam the President, trying to say, well, we will keep this going even though the President is in the fight. He does not belong to either this body or the other body, the Senate. No; no. He is in the executive branch. They are saying, "Oh, you know, we are going to make the President sign on this increase in Medicare premiums." Well, why would they do that? Because it is the only way they can jam it to him, "Either shut down the Government or sign on to our stupid idea to raise Medicare premiums."

Why would they want the President to sign up? Because they see themselves sinking in the polls. People are finally listening to that wonderful language they are paying all that money for to lure people into thinking they can do all the slashing and cutting without hurting anybody and not realizing they are going to get hurt. They are sinking in the polls. They want to find some way to force the President to sign on to their program, and it is either, "Sign on to the program, or we shut this Government down."



This is not a proud time for this country. This is tragic. This makes me terribly angry. But, of course, Members of Congress will get paid. That is outrageous, too.

I cannot believe that the leadership of this House has not stopped that nonsense and done it fast.

The other thing that was fully disclosed again in today's paper was about the party last night that was held by the other side of the aisle as we are getting ready to shut down the Congress. This was a party for GOPAC, GOPAC, the Speaker's PAC that raised so much money and is under such a cloud, and there are investigations going on, everything else. Nevertheless they came to town and had another big party, and they had the big kahuna of GOPAC come speak, none other than Rush Limbaugh himself, who stood there and said to all of these people who paid all of this money to keep GOPAC rich, he was hailing the GOP budget. He said, according to the paper and according to the C-SPAN tape, he thought it was wonderful because it would starve the poor and it would drive Medicare recipients, including his mother, to eat dog food, but, "Not to worry, mom," he says, "I am sending you a new can opener." Wow.

That tells you what today is about. That tells you what today is about. It is what is the concept of community we have for this country. Do we see this country only as a community where people come to make a lot of money, and if they make a lot of money, we ought to do everything we can to make sure they keep getting more and more money, the people who can pay to go to these fancy fundraisers? Do we see this as a community where, yes, you try to keep the strong business climate and all of that, but you also care for each other as family, and you do not make jokes about if mom will go on dog food, so what, I do not have to pay as much in taxes, and I will get her a new can opener. That is not my America, and I do not think that is funny, and I do not think it is funny that we are the laughingstock of the world today as we see people trying to shove this budget thing on the President, who has not even been in this.

This is not about whether we have a balanced budget in 7 years. We all agree we have to. It is who we cut to get there. And we happen to think you might be able to cut peanut subsidies or sugar subsidies or not give such a fat pay or tax increase to the rich, the people who bought all those tickets to the fundraiser. We do not think the defense contractors needed another \$8 billion beyond what the Defense Committee wanted.

We are not going to do that to my mom. I am not going to do that to my mom. The President is not going to do that to my mom.

Mr. President, veto that. Stand tall.

#### WE ARE GOING TO BALANCE THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, the truth is now documented. The President's latest veto shows that he does, in fact, not want to balance the budget.

This weekend I was in the Fourth District of Kansas. I was speaking with some of my constituents. One of them told me, well, it was going to happen sooner or later because there is a deep philosophical difference between the American public, those of us who believe we need to balance the budget and the President who apparently does not want a balanced budget. Well, they were absolutely right.

If you go back to the campaign when the President was running for office, he said that he would present a balanced budget that would balance in 5 years. We have yet to see that budget. Then he did present us a budget that would balance, allegedly, in 10 years. However, when it was scored by those in Congress who do scoring, we found out that it has a \$200 billion deficit a year for 10 years. It never balances.

Well, so now we have the facts out. He does not want to balance the budget. He has not presented us a balanced budget.

When he was given a budget that does actually balance in 7 years, he refuses to sign it.

Some of the allegations have been that there are things hung onto this continuing resolution and this temporary debt ceiling; that there should not be anything on there. "Send me something clean." There is a long history of hanging things on continuing resolutions.

You heard earlier there have been 57 continuing resolutions since 1977, 10 since 1980, and one of them during the 1980's hung the entire Federal Government's budget on one continuing resolution, not just a few riders, the entire budget for a whole year. So this is nothing new.

The President should not shirk away from it. His chief of staff should not tell people that it never happened before.

But the President has made it very clear there in his latest action not to balance the budget and reminds me of something my uncle John Armstrong told me when I was younger. He said, "When you don't want to do something bad enough, any excuse not to do it will do, any excuse will do." Well, you have heard one of the excuses. There are cuts in Medicare. Mr. Speaker, there are no cuts in Medicare. The average spending is going from \$4,800 per

recipient this year up to \$6,700 per recipient in 7 years. It is increasing by some 43 percent.

Well, I think it would be a little more clear maybe if you were a baseball player. If you understood there were 48 baseballs in this one bag and 67 baseballs in another bag and you said which bag has more baseballs, they had say you are increasing it 19 baseballs to 67. That is what we are doing with Medicare. We are increasing spending.

Medicare part B premiums are scheduled to go up \$7. The alternate plan, current law, is the Government's portion would increase, and individuals would go from 31 percent of the part B premium per month to 25 to 18 percent, and the Government's portion, which comes out of the general fund, which comes out of borrowed money, would go from 75 to 82 percent.

So what are we doing, after borrowing \$170 billion this year, we would have to increase that amount of money and pass that debt on to our children.

Right now our Federal debt is \$5 trillion. If you had gone into business the day after Christ rose from the dead and lost \$1 million that day and every day of every week of every month of every year almost 2,000 years, you would only be one-fifth of the way toward losing \$5 trillion. Most of us think that \$1 million a day would be a lot of money. To do that for almost 2,000 years and still not be a fifth of the way to the Federal debt is a phenomenal amount of money. Yet we want to stack more on top of that.

It is morally wrong to our children. We cannot afford it.

But by doing this, we will just force Medicare into bankruptcy sooner, put the debt on our children. Any excuse will do.

We have heard about cuts in nutrition programs. You remember last spring the President went to a school and said these children are going to starve under the Republicans' plan to balance the budget. I was in a school just recently in Wichita, KS, Dodge-Edison Elementary School. Not one child has been reported starving in that school. In fact, no reports across the Nation have any children starving in a school. It just was not true.

But, Mr. President, any excuse will do.

In fact, funding for nutrition programs is going up 4 percent each year the next 7 years, a total of \$1 billion.

Any excuse will do.

Cuts in Medicaid, funding for the poor is going up hundreds of millions of dollars in the Federal budget over the next 7 years.

Any excuse will do.

Well, Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, the American public is tired of the excuses. They are tired of business as usual. They are ready for a fresh wind in this country. They are ready for some hope. They are ready to balance the budget.

I head it in the Fourth District of Kansas.

I urge the President to come to the table with Congress. Let us sit down and see what your true problems are, but we are going to balance the budget.

#### GET DOWN TO THE SERIOUS BUSINESS OF GOVERNING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, like other Americans, I am greatly enjoying the comments of my Republican colleagues. It is remarkable how now, about 45 days after October 1, when the new fiscal year is to commence, my Republican colleagues have only gotten one of the appropriation bills signed. They have not passed the reconciliation bill or the budget. They have not passed the debt ceiling legislation.

They spend their time castigating and criticizing the President of the United States because of their own inability to carry out their comments about how they were going to run the country and balance the budget and do all the other things.

Only 1 of 13 appropriation bills has been signed. The rest are somewhere strewn around here. There has been one veto, and the reason that was is it was the Congress' own appropriation bill which my Republican colleagues sent down there and President Clinton said, "No, we are not going to sign that right now. You are not going to get your problems solved before we address the rest of the problems of the country."

So my comments to my Republican colleagues are, "Dear friends, you are in charge of this place. We have heard what you are going to do. Do it. Stop whining. Stop complaining. Get down to the business of governing, and if you cannot govern, admit it."

Now, what is in this budget about which my Republican colleagues talk so much? First of all, it savages the poor.

Second of all, it punishes almost every class in our society which does not have the means and the capability of addressing their problems. It lifts away the helping hand from those who have greatest needs. From Women, Infants, and Children's programs right through Medicare, Medicaid, and veterans' benefits, there are savage and unneeded cuts. There are expenditures for unneeded weaponry which the Defense Department says are needed, aircraft, submarines, and ships which the Defense Department says are unneeded are expended for in most lavish fashions by my Republican colleagues' budget.

Let us look at this budget. This budget cuts Women, Infants, and Chil-

dren's programs, nutrition and other health care programs for mothers during the period that they are carrying children and during the time that they are lactating and nursing their children. It cuts the health care program for the newborn and for the unborn. It cuts student loans. It cuts school lunches. It cuts assistance to young people as they start out trying to go through college to borrow money to pay for their education. It eliminates veterans' benefits in a way that is absolutely unjust. It will cause the closure of 41 veterans hospitals.

One million American veterans will not receive health care because of this Republican budget, and in addition to that 50,000 health care personnel from the VA will be laid off.

It must be somewhat painful to my Republican colleagues to hear this, because they have not been changing the budget but they have been castigating the Secretary of Veterans' Affairs. It appears at least they are beginning to understand, and the people are beginning to understand.

It cuts Medicare so that we can give a tax cut to the richest, and the people are beginning to be aware of this. My advice to my Republican colleagues is stop complaining, stop whining, get down to the serious business of governing, pass the legislation that you should have had on the President's desk by October 1, and then let us see what happens.

□ 1315

There have been complaints about the veto that the President just did. Well, there is good reason for that. The Republicans sought to intrude into how the President manages the fiscal affairs of the United States. So he vetoed that proposal.

The time has to be recognized as being here, that it is time that my Republican colleagues quite complaining, pass the legislation that they should have passed by October 1, and do the business of the country.

A lot of people say, well, the President will not talk. Well, the Republican leadership in this body early in the spring pointed out what they were going to do. They were going to jam this whole business down the President's throat by passing a piece of legislation which they said would compel him to swallow the Republican programs on the basis of either a take-it-or-leave-it or shut-the-government-down basis. That is why the situation is here.

Now, why do we have this situation? Because when Mr. Reagan came in, we had a budget deficit of \$700 billion. When Mr. Reagan and Mr. Bush left, we had a budget deficit of \$4.9 trillion. They blew it up on the basis of irresponsible government during that period of time. Now they are trying to blame the Democrats.

#### RIVERBOAT POLITICS SHOULD NOT BE TOLERATED

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CLINGER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, today the President had to veto the debt limit and will veto the continuing resolution. This should not come as a surprise to those of us who follow the politics and the people involved in this issue, because back in April the Speaker of the House, NEWT GINGRICH, predicted that he would create a titanic legislative standoff with President Clinton by adding vetoed bills to must-pass legislation increasing the debt limit.

In April, the Speaker made a decision that he would bring the Government to a halt. But he was assuming that the President would have vetoed a whole series of bills that were to be passed by the Congress between April and now, and he would put those bills back on the debt limit or to a continuing resolution, and the President would have to sign those. He made it clear then that he was prepared to bring the Government down.

But what has happened since that time is there has been a massive failure by the Republicans to pass those legislative measures. They have passed only 3 of the 13 appropriations bills. So when the Government shuts down tonight at midnight, it will not affect the Department of Agriculture, because the Department of Agriculture's appropriations bill has passed. But the Republicans have had a massive failure, unlike anything seen in modern Congresses, an inability to pass legislative appropriations billings for the coming fiscal year.

So what have they decided to do? They decided to shift the light off of their ineptness and the fact that their party is now captured by the most extreme elements of the Republican Party, and they have decided to shift the light away from that, to suggesting that somehow the President wants to bring the Government to a standstill.

The President has made it clear from the time that he passed the clean continuing resolution that we are operating under today back in September, that there was no need to bring the Government to a standstill. When the Republicans passed their bills, we could consider them then and he would either sign or veto them. When the Republicans pass their budget tonight, tomorrow or the end of this week they can be considered then.

But what the Republicans have chosen to do is to try and put a gun to the President's head and say "Sign this bill or the Government comes down. Sign this bill, or the Government of the



United States, for the first time in history, will default on its credit rate. Sign this bill, or millions of American homeowners will have higher interest rates because of that default."

That is no way to negotiate. The President of the United States has never given in to terrorists. He cannot give in to these kinds of terrorist activities by the Republicans when they are playing with the credit and well-being of the U.S. Government.

A clean CR can be passed through the Congress of the United States in a matter of hours this evening, in the House and Senate. A debt limit can be extended if it is clean in a matter of hours, and the American public need not suffer. The American economy need not suffer that, and America's credit rating in the rest of the world need not suffer that.

The Speaker made it clear again in September, he said "I do not care what the price is. I do not care if we have no Executive offices and no bonds for 30 days. Not this time." These are the reckless words of a reckless man, playing with his own ego, playing with his own political fortunes, whether he be up or down in the polls, as opposed to taking care of the business of this Nation, taking care of the economy of this Nation, and taking care of the credit rating of this Nation.

This kind of riverboat politics should not be tolerated. They should not be tolerated at a time when he sends a bill to the President suggesting that we are going to have to raise the premiums for Medicare recipients, but we will not address the other problems in Medicare costing money.

They did not send to the President a bill to address waste, fraud, and abuse in Medicare. They did not send a bill to the President on the debt limit to address the exorbitant doctors' fees and hospital costs that cannot be justified. They did not address those needs. No, they only addressed what the senior citizens have to increase in premiums, and, of course we know why they are doing that, because they seek to transfer those \$270 billion in Medicare savings. They seek to transfer \$245 billion to among the richest people in this country, a tax cut that cannot be justified when they are seeking the kinds of cuts that are in the social fabric of this country, when middle income people are not doing as well as they were in 1973. Yet the massive effort that we see here now is all about getting a tax cut, half of which goes to the top 5 percent of the people in the country.

It is unacceptable. A clean continuing resolution should be passed, a clean debt limit should be passed, and we should get on with the debate over the bills when the Republicans finally finish their debate within their party and pass those bills.

#### REALITIES OF LIVING ALONG THE BORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. BILBRAY] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to point out that a lot of people out in the real world America are watching the Republicans and the Democrats arguing about the budget issue. And it is sort of interesting to see that people who claim to be protecting the seniors again and again would actually encourage a veto of a bill that would guarantee that something be stopped that the seniors of America have been sick and tired of having happened too often.

I am just a freshman. I do not know about all these great tactics. But I know one thing: Seniors in my district are sick and tired of the Federal Government dipping into their reserve fund for Social Security and Medicaid and other reserve funds. They want that put aside for them, so that they have some guarantee. All this maneuvering may sound real good in Washington, but my seniors want the President and Congress to keep their fingers off the Social Security trust fund and the Medicare trust fund and the other trust funds and figure out how to run government without raiding those funds.

But, Mr. Speaker, I am not here to speak about that today. I am here to sort of remind Washington, DC, of the realities of those of us that live along the border. I am privileged to represent the communities in San Diego that happen to be on the international frontier. Mr. Speaker, while we hear all about Washington, about how Operation Gatekeeper secured the border, that we have control, that do not worry about it, well, Mr. Speaker, I guess the message really struck home this week, because while Secretary Babbitt was visiting us in San Diego, Mr. Babbitt learned something that those of us in San Diego and along the border know all too often. He went out to get his van. It happened that his van was gone. The van had been stolen.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is a day later his van was found. It has 39 illegal aliens in it going down the freeway. Welcome to San Diego and the border, Mr. Secretary. This is what we live with along the border every day of the year.

The fact is those of us in the Southwest put up with our cars being stolen and shipped south and north, because of the no man's land that the Federal Government continues to allow to occur along the border, and the immorality of the Federal Government to have the gall to try to say that they have secured the area. I think it is terrible and propagates this concept that the people cannot trust Washington, especially when they know their cars are disappearing.

I have one constituent that has gone out four times, and all he has left of the four cars that used to be there is a bag of plastic where they had torn up his car to be able to break in and take it.

Not only do the cars go north, Mr. Speaker, but they also go south. We have been able to photograph Mexican Federal officials driving American cars down south. A lot of us supported free trade with Mexico, but let me assure you, this is not the free trade we had planned. And the Mexican officials do not even have the decency to take the license plate off the car. They still have California license plates out there, Mr. Speaker.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that Secretary Babbitt get together with the President and remind him that things are not under control along the border, that common decency says the Federal Government must straighten this out. And if he does not care about his own car, I ask that you recognize the same day this happened that tragedy occurred in the Tijuana River, where four illegal aliens tried to swim the river back because they were concerned about being caught by immigration officials and they drowned. There are four families in Mexico, Mr. Speaker, who are going to have bodies shipped back to them in body bags because they were told in Mexico come on into America. We will let you in illegally. And they tried it, and they are now dead, and their families are going to have to accept the body bags.

That is the immorality, Mr. Speaker, of our American Government not controlling our national sovereignty. And in the words of the ex-Governor of Baja, CA, that ring quite clearly to those of us along the border, we need to recognize that American sovereignty is not only a right, it is a responsibility, and it is a responsibility of the Federal Government that they have to finally bear.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There being no further requests for morning business, pursuant to clause 12, rule I, the House will stand in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 p.m.

#### PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray using the words of Maltbie Davenport Babcock's hymn:

This is my Father's world,  
And to my listening ears  
All nature sings, and round me rings  
The music of the spheres.  
This is my Father's world; I rest me in the  
thought  
Of rocks and trees of skies and seas,  
His hand the wonders wrought.  
This is my Father's world,  
O let me ne'er forget  
That though the wrong seems oft so strong,  
God is the Ruler yet.  
This is my Father's world;  
Why should my heart be sad?  
The Lord is King, let the heavens sing;  
God reigns, let the earth be glad!

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

The point of order is considered withdrawn.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] will lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. DURBIN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### OUR COUNTRY NEEDS LEADERSHIP

(Mr. EWING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, candidate Clinton ran on a pledge to balance the budget in 5 years, and now he is willing to shut down the Government rather than agree to balance it in 7 years.

The President's administration and special interest groups friendly to that administration are very loose with the facts. They are using distortion to scare senior citizens into believing that the Republicans are raising Medicare

premiums, when all we are doing is keeping premiums at the current rate rather than dropping it and then raising it again.

The administration and representatives from there are claiming that our budget proposals would destroy the environment, environment and educational programs, and they know that is not true also. But their pollsters, by the way, tell them that these are good issues.

What I am getting at, Mr. Speaker, is that our country needs leadership, not pandering to political special interests. The President should accept the leadership from this Congress' offer to work out our budget problems.

### LITTLE SUBSTANCE TO STORY ABOUT SECRETARY O'LEARY

(Mr. BROWN of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday the Wall Street Journal ran an article that was mildly critical of Secretary O'Leary at the Energy Department and used the words of accusing her of conducting investigations of reporters who were covering her agency. The article was not that bad, but it provided sufficient ammunition that a number of our colleagues immediately leaped into the breach, hoping that a major scandal was developing and issued "Dear Colleague" letters and a proposed letter to the President requiring the firing of Secretary O'Leary.

This was basically a reflection of the delicate emotional state that exists in Washington right now rather than being based on any substantive information, and I will be sending out a "Dear Colleague" letter today that will reflect more of the facts of this situation.

The firm was terminated 2 months before the story ran. It does not do investigative work, as the article alleges, and there is very little substance to the entire story.

### PRESIDENT DOES NOT WANT TO BALANCE THE BUDGET

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, if the Government shuts down tonight, the responsibility is going to rest squarely on President Clinton's shoulders.

We have sent him a debt limit increase and will send him a continuing resolution to keep the Government operating, but he says he will veto these bills. Why is the President choosing to shut down the Government? It is because when it comes to push to shove,

he flat does not want to balance the budget. That is what it amounts to.

The bills the President will veto today just require him really to put his money where his mouth is, do something he has never had to do, and that is practice what he preaches. After all his talk about balancing the budget and reining in the Federal spending and downsizing Government, today the President is going to demonstrate in no uncertain terms that he just does not have the courage.

We cannot let our President's unwillingness to govern jeopardize our country's future.

### NONESSENTIAL WORKERS NOT NEEDED

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, something does not add up, Mr. Speaker. Experts say, "Don't worry, America, if the Federal Government shuts down, only nonessential workers will be furloughed." That is right, nonessential.

Now, the dictionary says "non-essential" basically means not necessary. Now, if that is the case, did anyone around here ever stop to think that if Congress did not borrow money to hire nonessential workers, Congress would not have to borrow more money to pay nonessential workers and Congress would not have to shut down.

Beam me up, Mr. Speaker, Maybe, just maybe, the Congress of the United States is a little nonessential.

I yield back the balance of any essence that might be in this message.

### PRESIDENT NEEDS TO MEET WITH CONGRESSIONAL LEADERS

(Mr. TIAHRT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, over the weekend, Speaker GINGRICH from the House and Senate Majority Leader DOLE from the Senate displayed true leadership by calling the President on the phone in a genuine attempt to reconcile the differences over the budget.

But what happened? The President was gracious enough to let Senator DOLE speak one sentence and the Speaker of the House two sentences. But then he proceeded to blast both of them and basically hung up.

The fact is the President does not want to balance the budget, not in 10 years as he proposed, which ended up being \$200 billion over each of the 10 years in deficit, but also in 7 years, the plan we presented him with.

Mr. Speaker, this is why we stand on the brink of a government shutdown. This is why the budget is not balanced. This is what the American people are tired of, business as usual, excuses.



The President needs to spend less time on the golf course and more time meeting with congressional leaders to iron out their differences and make Government work, but if the President chooses, he can shut the Government down.

#### TAKE EXTRANEEOUS MATTERS OUT OF DEBT LIMIT AND BUDGET BILLS

(Mr. WARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the ironic statement made by Speaker GINGRICH yesterday concerning the debt limit extension. In reference to our President, Speaker GINGRICH said, "We are not willing to give you a blank check. We are not willing to give you an open credit card account," he said to President Clinton, when, in fact, it is the Speaker who is asking for a blank check to raise Medicare premiums and slash our environmental protection laws.

Speaker GINGRICH is using what is usually a set of bipartisan bills that are procedural in nature that need to be passed to continue our Government's operation, he is using these bills to move his extremist agenda because he knows he has not succeeded through the normal channels.

I stand here as one who has voted for a balanced budget, but not one that the Speaker liked.

These extreme extraneous matters have no business being in these bills, and they should be debated separately.

#### LET US SAY NO TO PORK-BARREL SPENDING

(Mr. CHABOT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHABOT. I thought my ears were playing tricks on me yesterday when I heard White House Chief of Staff Leon Panetta say that this Congress is going to have to learn to do things the old-fashioned way. By that, he means, of course, business as usual.

Well, I had a chance to go back home to Cincinnati over the weekend. Unlike the President, I did not play golf, I did not consult with any high-priced pollsters.

But I did have the opportunity to talk to the type of people, the regular folks back in fact in Cincinnati, who sent me here to Congress. They did not tell me to vote the old pork-barrel way, as Mr. Panetta encourages. They told me to stick to my guns, to do what I promised I would do, to keep working to balance the budget.

During his campaign, candidate Bill Clinton promised to balance the budget in 5 years. Now that he is in the White

House, he refuses to even discuss balancing it in 7 years. Still Mr. Speaker, the President should not underestimate the intelligence of the American taxpayers. They know the political gamesmanship when they see it, and they do not like it.

They want us to balance the budget. Let us do it now.

#### THE PRESIDENT DOES HAVE A BUDGET

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, the President does have a budget. He does have a budget that balances in 7 years. The issue is: Who do you cut?

I think it is outrageous today that many hard-working Federal employees in my State of Colorado are standing there quaking as this holiday season approaches, wondering how long people are going to play with their lives and play with their paychecks.

I want to remind you that Time magazine in June of this year quoted the Speaker as saying the President can run parts of the Government that are left or he can run no Government and the Speaker went on to say, "Which of the two of us do you think worries about government not showing up?"

Well, that tells you how casually they are playing to get an extreme, mean agenda through. This is not about balancing the budget. This is about whether you balance it on your mom's back or the kids' back so you can pay off fat cats, or you do what is fair and what is right in the American way.

I am sorry that Federal employees in my region are being used as pawns in this game. I would not do that.

#### REPUBLICANS COMMITTED TO A REAL BALANCED BUDGET

(Mrs. SEASTRAND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, this is the national debt as of last week: 4 trillion, 985 billion, 913 million, 11 thousand and 32 dollars, and 65 cents.

I have a question. If someone could lay each dollar of the debt end to end around the equator, how many times would it circle the Earth? The answer—18,635 times.

I have another question. How many balanced budgets has President Clinton introduced? The answer—zero.

Now it is true that the President claims to have introduced a balanced budget. But upon further inspection by the CBO, his budget really does not balance at all. In the year 2005, President Clinton's deficit would be over \$200 billion.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans are committed to a real balanced budget and saying no to big government and the tax and spend policies of the past.

Let's end the excuses and balance the budget now.

□ 1415

#### NO BUDGET, NO PAY FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

(Mr. DURBIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, remember when a little child would say to you, "I am going to hold my breath until I turn blue in the face?" That is exactly what is going on with the politicians here in Washington. Can you imagine for a minute that we are going to shut down the Federal Government, that our political egos are that colossal?

Think about this for a second: Tomorrow we are going to send 800,000 Federal workers home without pay, while Members of Congress still receive their paychecks. That is fundamentally unfair and wrong.

H.R. 2281, which I introduced with Senator BOXER of California, says no budget, no pay. If this train wrecks, then Speaker GINGRICH and the train crew and all of the rest of us will not be paid until the train is back on the track and running again.

Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress should start focusing a little more on solving problems, rather than creating them, with no budget, no pay.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry you left the Chamber. I am sorry that Speaker GINGRICH is not here. My request to him is put whatever else is on the calendar aside. Pass no budget, no pay, and this crisis will be over.

#### BALANCING FEDERAL BUDGET IS FISCALLY RESPONSIBLE

(Mr. RIGGS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, let me just point out to my colleagues that the gentleman from Illinois who just spoke, when he had an opportunity out on this House floor to vote for a balanced budget resolution, failed to do so. He voted against the Republican version of a balanced budget 7-year plan; he voted against the Democrat substitute. In fact, Mr. Speaker, when the Democrats offered their version of a balanced budget plan out here on the floor, only 72 out of 199 Democrats voted for it.

We are the party that is trying to be fiscally responsible. We are putting forward a plan to balance the budget in 7 years by limiting the growth, the increase in Federal spending, to 3 percent

per year. We want the President to affirm his willingness to meet us halfway and honestly balance the budget and work with, not against, this Congress.

#### DO WHAT IS RIGHT FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

(Mr. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, because the Republicans have not passed the budget for September 30, 1995, for the next fiscal year, they want to blame the default of this Government, of the shutdown tonight at midnight, on the Democrats.

Stop the foolishness, Republicans. Speaker GINGRICH, on the GOP budget strategy, said "The President will veto a number of things, and we will put them all on the debt ceiling, and then he will decide how much of a crisis he wants." That is according to the Washington Times, April 3, 1995.

The Washington Post of September 2, 1995, quotes Speaker GINGRICH: "I do not care what the price is. I do not care if we have no executive offices and no bonds for 30 days. Not at this time."

It is wrong for the Republicans to treat the American people this way. Let us do what is right for this Nation. Let us send a clean CR to the President, and a clean debt ceiling as well.

#### TIME FOR A BALANCED BUDGET

(Mr. EHLERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join in decrying the coming crisis. However, I believe it is extremely important to resolve the crisis that we are facing, and believe we should not shut down the Government.

Let me just give some of the facts. You heard earlier from the gentlewoman from California that the deficit is above \$4.9 trillion; in fact, within a few weeks it will be \$5 trillion. In one-thousand dollar bills, that would be a stack 300 miles out into space. We have to address the deficit problem.

The Republicans have addressed it. We have voted for a balanced budget. I applaud those Democrats in this Chamber who have voted for a balanced budget proposal. The President's proposal, 18 pages long, does not even begin to outline a solution.

I believe it is time for the President to come to the table to meet in all sincerity with the Speaker and the majority leader of the Senate. It is time for us to reach agreement on a balanced budget. The American people demand it. They deserve it. Let us pass a balanced budget.

#### DO NOT BALANCE BUDGET BY MEDICARE INCREASES

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I was so proud to read over the weekend that the President has indicated that he will not sign a continuing budget resolution because of the increase in Medicare payments. I think it is really awful to think that the Republican leadership in this House has said that unless the President agrees to increase Medicare part B premiums, which would go from \$46.10 per month to \$53.50 per month, when they are scheduled under current law to be decreased to \$42.50 per month. What the Republican leadership is saying is unless you sign this continuing resolution, we are going to make sure that the Medicare premiums go up.

It is not fair to American senior citizens. Over the weekend I talked to a lot of senior citizens. They cannot afford the Medicare part B increase being proposed by the Republican leadership. It is not fair to hold the budget and the Government hostage to this Medicare increase. The President recognizes it. I commend him for the fact he refuses to sign this continuing resolution, primarily because of the Medicare increase.

#### HOW TO ACHIEVE A BALANCED BUDGET IN 7 YEARS

(Mr. SMITH of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, if honesty were the high road, too often in this debate we are at a much lower level, traveling the course of what happens to the future of this country.

Do we want a balanced budget in 7 years or less or do we not and, if we do, how should we try to change politicians' behavior around to achieve that goal?

What we have done in this case is try to say that we are going to use the continuing resolution, that we are going to try to use the temporary increase in the debt ceiling, to change what politicians have been doing since the 1920's, and we are actually in some areas going to cut some of the funds that have been going into some of those discretionary programs.

In Medicare, it is a farce. It comes as a strong untruth between what the President and the Democrats in the Senate have already suggested of the changes and where we end up with Medicare reform.

#### AMERICA IS PRESENTED WITH A MANUFACTURED CRISIS

(Mr. DOGGETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, today America is presented with a manufactured crisis, and the inventor of this crisis, the person with all the rights to the patent to this crisis and all the silliness attendant to it, is one Speaker NEWT GINGRICH.

Way back on April 3, he made very clear his determination to manufacture this crisis. He reiterated it on June 3, saying that he hardly worried whether the Government would show up. And then finally on September 22, he said to all that were listening then what was going to happen tonight, he said "I do not care what the price is. I do not care if we have no Executive offices and no bonds for 30 days. Not this time."

Well, the American people do care. They want their Government working together to take care of the problems that we have, and they do not want to have to pick up the tab for this unnecessary invention, for unless Speaker GINGRICH plans to pay personally for the cost of this whole mishap with the proceeds of the next couple of books that he does with Rupert Murdoch, it is the American taxpayer who will have to pick up the price for this weird invention.

#### CONGRESS FAILED TO COMPLETE ITS WORK

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, as one who represents 56,000 Federal employees and therefore has always been concerned about the failure of this Congress and the President to do their work in a timely fashion, causing the Government to temporarily shut down, I rise to express once again my deep regret that the Congress of the United States has not done its job.

The fact of the matter is, the only reason there needs to be a continuing resolution signed today or passed today is because we have not done our work, period. All the other rhetoric about balanced budgets, all the other rhetoric about the politics in the White House, are, frankly, not accurate.

There are nine appropriation bills that neither the House nor the Senate have finally acted upon. Therefore, this crisis could have been averted had we done our work.

#### NOW IS THE TIME TO GET A BALANCED BUDGET

(Mr. WALKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1



minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, what we have heard on the floor today is the liberal extremists who will do virtually anything that they can to stop a balanced budget from taking place. They will just obstruct, they will use anything in their power to stop a balanced budget from taking place.

Now, they would have you believe that they are simply acting for good government. The fact is what they are doing is trying to stop the American family from saving \$37,000 in interest costs on their mortgage, because that is what a balanced budget would do. They are trying to stop the American people from getting \$900 less in interest payments on the family car that they purchase, because that is what a balanced budget would do. They are trying to stop people from getting a \$10,000 interest advantage on their student loans, because that is what a balanced budget would do.

The liberal extremists have fought Ronald Reagan, they fought George Bush, they have fought us all the way along. Now when it comes a time when we have an opportunity to really get a balanced budget, they are on this floor fighting again.

Mr. Speaker, we need a balanced budget. Now is the time to get one.

#### POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCINNIS). The Chair would state that under the rules of the House, the gentleman cannot be recognized for a point of personal privilege based on debate during 1-minute speeches.

#### TIME TO BALANCE BUDGET IS NOW

(Mr. BOEHNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, we have heard about CR's and debt limits, all of this minutia, and we all know this is not what this fight is about. It is about whether we are going to leave for our children and theirs a better future than what our parents left for us.

Each succeeding generation in America has left for its children and its grandchildren a brighter future for them, and what are we leaving for our children? Five trillion dollars' worth of debt. That is what we are doing.

We have heard every excuse in the world why we cannot balance the budget for 30 years. We have heard every Washington gimmick used why we cannot do it. The time is now. We are going to balance the budget to save the future for my girls, my two teenage girls, and every kid of America.

#### NOTHING THAT HAPPENS TODAY WILL BALANCE THE BUDGET

(Mr. FLAKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLAKE. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania, after I spoke, talked about liberal extremists and the balanced budget. As one who has voted on numerous occasions for the balanced budget constitutional amendment, as one who voted for the Stenholm balanced budget that did not pass, and as one who voted for the coalition budget which would balance the budget in 7 years, faster than the budget offered by the other side, I do not believe that I fall in that category.

I say again, nothing that happens today will balance the budget, whether the President signs the continuing resolution or not. The fact of the matter is there would be no necessity for a continuing resolution if this House and the Senate had passed appropriation bills in a timely fashion. They cannot agree. They have not done that, and that is why we are here as we are.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House a communication from the Chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure; which was read and, without objection, referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, September 14, 1995.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,

Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed are copies of resolutions adopted today by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. One resolution approves construction of protective works at the South Water Treatment Plant in Chicago, Illinois, pursuant to section 201 of the Flood Control Act of 1965. The remaining resolutions authorize studies of potential water resources projects by the Secretary of the Army in accordance with the provisions of section 4 of the Act of March 4, 1913, and other statutes.

Sincerely,

BUD SHUSTER, Chairman.

There was no objection.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that he will

postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered or on which a vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV. Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken after the debate is concluded on all motions to suspend the results, but not before 5 p.m. today.

□ 1430

#### ELECTRONIC FILING AND PRESERVATION OF FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION REPORTS

Mr. THOMAS, Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2527), to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to improve the electoral process by permitting electronic filing and preservation of Federal Election Commission reports, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2527

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. ELECTRONIC FILING AND PRESERVATION OF FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION REPORTS.

(a) SECTION 304 AMENDMENT.—Subsection (a) of section 304 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 434(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(11)(A) The Commission shall permit reports required by this Act to be filed and preserved by means of computer disk or any other appropriate electronic format or method, as determined by the Commission.

"(B) In carrying out subparagraph (A) with respect to filing of reports, the Commission shall provide for one or more methods (other than requiring a signature on the report being filed) for verifying reports filed by means of computer disk or other electronic format or method. Any verification under the preceding sentence shall be treated for all purposes (including penalties for perjury) in the same manner as a verification by signature.

"(C) As used in this paragraph, the term 'report' means, with respect to the Commission, a report, designation, or statement required by this Act to be filed with the Commission."

(b) SECTION 302 AMENDMENT.—Subsection (d) of section 302 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 432(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: "for any report filed in electronic format under section 304(a)(11), the treasurer shall retain a machine-readable copy of the report as the copy preserved under the preceding sentence."

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) and subsection (b) shall apply with respect to reports for periods beginning after December 31, 1996.

#### SEC. 2. WAIVER OF DUPLICATE FILING REQUIREMENT FOR STATES WITH ELECTRONIC ACCESS TO FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION REPORTS AND STATEMENTS.

Section 312 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 439) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(c) Subsections (a) and (b) shall not apply with respect to any State that, as determined by the Commission, has a system that

permits electronic access to, and duplication of, reports and statements that are filed with the Commission."

**SEC. 3. FILING OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ELECTION REPORTS WITH THE FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION, RATHER THAN WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.**

(a) SECTION 302 AMENDMENTS.—Subsection (g) of section 302 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 432(g)) is amended—

(1) by striking out paragraph (1);  
(2) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (5) as paragraphs (1) through (4), respectively;

(3) in paragraph (2), as so redesignated by paragraph (2) of this subsection—

(A) by striking out "Clerk of the House of Representatives and the"; and

(B) by striking out "them" and inserting in lieu thereof "the Secretary";

(4) in paragraph (3), as so redesignated by paragraph (2) of this subsection, by striking out "paragraphs (1) and (2)" and inserting in lieu thereof "Paragraph (1)"; and

(5) in paragraph (4), as so redesignated by paragraph (2) of this subsection, by striking out "Clerk of the House of Representatives and the".

(b) SECTION 304 AMENDMENTS.—Section 304 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 434) is amended

(1) in the first sentence of subsection (a)(6), by striking out "Clerk, the Secretary," and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary"; and

(2) in the third sentence of subsection (c)(2), by striking out "Clerk, the Secretary," and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

(c) SECTION 311 AMENDMENT.—Section 311(a)(4) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 438(a)(4)) is amended by striking out "Clerk, Secretary," and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to reports, designations, and statements required to be filed after December 31, 1995.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCINNIS). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2527 changes both the way in which candidate committees and other committees can file with the Federal Election Commission and it removes an impediment to the public's right to know as soon as possible the information surrounding a candidate in that candidate's report if the candidate is running for the House of Representatives.

H.R. 2527 passed the Committee on House Oversight unanimously. What we did was to examine the current way in which candidates and incumbent Members of the House file their campaign reports with the FEC.

First of all, they do not file the reports with the FEC, they file them with the Clerk of the House. The Clerk of the House then forwards the reports of all of the candidates, incumbents as

well as challengers, to the FEC. What occurs is a delay of up to 3 days where the public does not know what is in those reports.

H.R. 2527 does away with the requirement that candidates for Congress, both incumbents and challengers, file with the Clerk of the House. Under H.R. 2527, candidates will file directly with the FEC as other committees are required to file.

In addition to that, it seems to me that campaigns are now run sufficiently using electronic technology that candidates who so choose—there is no requirement—but if candidates choose to file with the FEC, the FEC should accept those filings electronically, beginning in 1997. This reform continues to update the capabilities of the FEC so that as more and more campaign information is stored electronically and reported electronically, the information in those candidates' reports can be turned over to the public more quickly. It seems to me that the FEC should be, first of all, given the opportunity to allow people to file electronically and the Committee on House Oversight will then review how successful that procedure has been.

Since we are allowing the FEC to require candidates to file records with the FEC electronically, we also then waive the requirement that committees file with a State that also files electronically, since that would duplicate materials.

So H.R. 2527, although not a comprehensive piece of legislation, I think nevertheless begins the 104th Congress as the new majority's examination of the way in which we run campaigns.

Although the committee is continuing to hold hearings on a larger issue of candidates and their running for office, in this particular area, with the ability to file electronically, to waive duplication where filing electronically is involved, and to remove an impediment to the public's right to know, it seems to me that we have taken a modest, but positive, step forward, and I would urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2527.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join the distinguished gentleman from California in supporting H.R. 2527.

This is a measure which allows more efficient and cost-effective procedures and which will substantially benefit both the public and congressional candidates.

H.R. 2527 would require House candidate committees to file directly with the Federal Election Commission, thus eliminating the current procedure of filing first with the Clerk of the House. This would become effective December 31 of this year and will speed up the FEC's ability to receive, process, and

disclose campaign committee information. Members would continue to have immediate access to filing data. The media and the public will be able to retrieve candidate committee information in a more timely fashion.

The bill also allows the Commission to receive electronically filed campaign reports from candidates and political committees. At the moment this is not a requirement, strictly a voluntary procedure which will go into effect December 31, 1996.

Finally, as States obtain the necessary retrieval equipment, candidates and committees will no longer have to duplicate all their filings within their respective States. This burdensome redundancy will be eliminated without any loss of information, as all candidate and committee data will be immediately available from the FEC.

There are a number of benefits associated with this legislation. The Clerk's Office has estimated saving some \$500,000. States, candidates, and committees will all save money.

But the biggest winner will be the public's more rapid access to campaign reports.

Now there will be some costs to the Federal Election Commission, particularly in the startup and staffing of the point of entry section of the bill.

At our committee hearing on October 25, Chairman THOMAS noted that both the authorizing and appropriating committees had set aside \$1.5 million in fiscal year 1996 for the FEC to update its internal computer capabilities. The Commission has indicated that it can handle whatever additional costs are required for implementing H.R. 2527 if it has access to this \$1.5 million, although, obviously, its internal modernization program will be slowed to the extent these funds are used for other purposes.

There has been some confusion in the various exchanges that have taken place between the Oversight and the Appropriations Committees in order to bring about agreement on this legislation, but I believe we have now reached an understanding.

The minority has made it clear from the beginning that our support for this bill, whose concepts we strongly endorse, is predicated on full funding. No matter how desirable single point of entry is, we are not going to be party to any attempt to further weaken the FEC in carrying out its mandated duties.

We have worked hard to move this legislation forward and we do not want any misunderstandings. The Federal Election Commission has already taken two deep budget cuts—a \$1.4 million rescission out of its fiscal year 1995 budget, and over another million cut from its fiscal year 1996 authorization—which was \$1.5 million below the Commission's bottom-line request.

Mr. Speaker, last week Chairman THOMAS initiated a series of hearings



on campaign finance reform legislation. Our first witnesses included the Speaker, the minority leader, and more than a dozen Members. It was an excellent hearing, and there will be more and Chairman THOMAS is to be commended.

This bill is a small part of campaign finance reform, but it is a step forward. The ability of the Federal Election Commission to fully carry out its responsibilities of disclosure, audit, and enforcement is a big part of campaign finance reform. The FEC is the public's policeman for campaign contributions and spending. There is no intent that this legislation should in anyway interfere with the Commission's ability to fully perform its duties during the crucial upcoming election year, or to use any funds other than the fenced-off \$1.5 million for purposes of implementing this legislation.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD a statement by the ranking member, the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], and a copy of a letter dated November 9, 1995, from the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, to Mr. Danny McDonald, Chairman of the Federal Election Commission.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join the distinguished gentleman from California in supporting H.R. 2527.

This is a measure which allows more efficient and cost-effective procedures and which will substantially benefit both the public and congressional candidates.

H.R. 2527 would require House candidate committees to file directly with the Federal Election Commission, thus eliminating the current procedure of filing first with the Clerk of the House. This would become effective December 31 of this year and will speed up the FEC's ability to receive, process, and disclose campaign committee information. Members would continue to have immediate access to filing data. The media and the public will be able to retrieve candidate committee information in a more timely fashion.

The bill also allows the Commission to receive electronically filed campaign reports from candidates and political committees. At the moment this is not a requirement, strictly a voluntary procedure which will go into effect December 31, 1996.

Finally, as States obtain the necessary retrieval equipment, candidates and committees will no longer have to duplicate all their filings within their respective States. This burdensome redundancy will be eliminated without any loss of information, as all candidate and committee data will be immediately available from the FEC.

There are a number of benefits associated with this legislation. The Clerk's Office has estimated saving some \$500,000. States, candidates, and committees will all save money.

But the biggest winner will be the public's more rapid access to campaign reports.

Now there will be some costs to the Federal Election Commission, particularly in the start-up and staffing of the point of entry section of the bill.

At our committee hearing on October 25, Chairman THOMAS noted that both the authorizing and appropriating committees had set aside \$1.5 million in fiscal year 1996 for the FEC to update its internal computer capabilities. The Commission has indicated that it can handle whatever additional costs are required for implementing H.R. 2527 if it has access to this \$1.5 million, although, obviously, its internal modernization program will be slowed to the extent these funds are used for other purposes.

There has been some confusion in the various exchanges that have taken place between the Oversight and the Appropriations Committees in order to bring about agreement on this legislation, but I believe we have now reached an understanding.

I want to thank Mr. LIVINGSTON, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, for his cooperation, and I want to give special recognition to my colleague, STENY HOYER.

Mr. HOYER, who is ranking member on the Appropriations' Treasury and Postal Affairs Subcommittee, has always been a strong supporter of the Federal Election Commission and of campaign reform. He has played a key role in working out the details on the funding for this legislation.

The minority has made it clear from the beginning that our support for this bill, whose concepts we strongly endorse, is predicated on full funding. No matter how desirable single point of entry is, we are not going to be party to any attempt to further weaken the FEC in carrying out its mandated duties.

We have worked hard to move this legislation forward and we do not want any misunderstandings. The Federal Election Commission has already taken two deep budget cuts—a \$1.4 million rescission out of its fiscal year 1995 budget, and over another million cut from its fiscal year 1996 authorization—which was \$1.5 million below the Commission's bottom-line request.

Mr. Speaker, last week Chairman THOMAS initiated a series of hearings on campaign finance reform legislation. Our first witnesses included the Speaker, the minority leader, and more than a dozen Members. It was an excellent hearing, and there will be more and Chairman THOMAS is to be commended.

This bill is a small part of campaign finance reform, but it is a step forward. The ability of the Federal Election Commission to fully carry out its responsibilities of disclosure, audit, and enforcement is a big part of campaign finance reform. The FEC is the public's policeman for campaign contributions and spending. There is no intent that this legislation should in anyway interfere with the Commission's ability to fully perform its duties during the crucial upcoming election year, or to use any funds other than the fenced-off \$1.5 million for purposes of implementing this legislation.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,  
Washington, DC, November 9, 1995.

MR. DANNY L. McDONALD,  
Chairman, Federal Election Commission, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Following up on my letter of November 2, 1995, I am pleased to learn the FEC can assume single point of entry without adding to current full time employment levels. Based on staff conversa-

tions, it is my understanding that FEC will accomplish single point of entry by reassigning employees and contracting out work, if necessary. I also understand that FEC is not able to provide the Committee with a cost estimate for contracting out this work at this time but would appreciate the FEC forwarding such an estimate, when available.

Again, let me state that I support using a portion of the \$1.5 million fenced in FY 1996 for internal ADP modernization on electronic filing initiatives such as those authorized in H.R. 2527. I am confident that single point of entry can be achieved within the CBO cost estimate of less than \$500,000 in FY 1996 and FEC cost estimates of \$400,000–\$500,000. I encourage you to keep the Committee informed of any deviation from these estimates.

Sincerely,

BOB LIVINGSTON,  
Chairman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] indicated that perhaps there had been some difficulty in communication between the policy committee, which is the Committee on House Oversight, and the Committee on Appropriations.

I would say to the gentleman that perhaps the confusion was more in the eye of the beholder, and in listening to various dollar amounts that we are discussing vis-a-vis the FEC, I do think we would be remiss if we do not put on the record that by closing down the House Clerk operation for review of all of those campaign reports, we are going to be saving more than half a million dollars a year. Although we certainly do want to look at savings in any particular one area, we also have to look at the larger picture.

Mr. Speaker, I believe practice that cost the Clerk's Office a half a million dollars per year for a needless and unnecessary slowdown in the public's access to the information that is in campaign reports is a practice that needed to be ended for a long time. With this new majority, we are ending that practice.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding, and I rise in support of H.R. 2527, which will allow candidates' campaign committees to electronically file campaign reports with the Federal Election Commission. This is an issue that I have supported for many years, and I believe that it is a good thing that it is coming before the House at this time.

The bill also requires House candidates to file reports directly with the FEC instead of with the Clerk of the House.

I want to commend my friend Mr. THOMAS, for bringing this commonsense bill to the House floor and thank

the ranking minority member, Mr. FAZIO, and in his absence the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. HOYER, both of whom have been very cooperative with this timely issue.

The bill allows the FEC to move into the computer age by accepting the electronic transmission of campaign reports. Candidates will be allowed to cut down on the paper shuffling if they choose to use the electronic system. This process will also speed the reporting of campaign contributions to enhance the voters' access to the disclosure of campaign contributions.

It is important to note that this is a voluntary system. It will not burden campaign committees with mandates if they are not computerized, but it will allow committees to file electronically if it eases their operation.

This bill will also require candidates to file reports directly with the FEC, and this provision will end the absurd system that requires candidates to file campaign reports with the Clerk of the House, and then force the Clerk to keep copies of the reports and make micro-filmed copies to send to the FEC, and then the FEC would print hard copies of the reports from the Clerk's microfilm.

The current system is a case study in unnecessary bureaucratic paper shuffling and obviously creates unwanted extra cost. Requiring candidates to file directly with the FEC will end the confusion and the outrageous duplication of the effort.

The FEC will work with original filings instead of the blurred copies which make it more difficult for the FEC to electronically scan the information. It will also save thousands of dollars in the Clerk's office.

This bill may have prompted some confusion, as has been alleged earlier, on how the FEC would implement the bill, but I am pleased that the FEC now has clarified their earlier request and that they are not pushing for more employees to accomplish this single point of entry.

I want to reiterate that I support using a portion of the \$1.5 million fenced in fiscal year 1996 for the computer modernization on electronic filing initiatives such as those authorized in H.R. 2527. I am confident that single point of entry can be achieved for less than the CBO cost estimate of a half a million dollars, and the FEC's estimate of between \$400,000 to \$500,000 makes sense.

This bill will speed disclosure, reduce duplication and move the FEC toward computer modernization. I encourage my colleagues to give it their full support.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. EHLERS], a valued member of the Committee on House Oversight.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to rise in strong support of H.R. 2527. Just 2 years ago I ran for Congress for the first time. I was very surprised when the time came to file the first campaign finance report and discovered that I had to file a copy with the secretary of state in the State of Michigan and a copy with the Clerk of the House. I just assumed that the report would go to the FEC. I did not realize it would take a few days for them to get it.

What amazed me even more is that when the news media wanted to find out what we had expended on the campaign, they did not go to the secretary of state of Michigan, they did not go to the Clerk of the House, and of course they could not get it from the FEC; they came to our campaign office and we had to run off multiple copies for the media.

□ 1445

This bill will cure those problems. The report will be filed with the agency that is responsible of reviewing it, the FEC. That is where it appropriately belongs. Even more importantly, we can file by electronic means. I certainly will take advantage of that. It will save a lot of work, it will save a lot of postage, and it will certainly speed up the time that the press will have to spend scanning these particular reports.

Once again Mr. Speaker, I believe it is an excellent bill and I rise in strong support of this bill. I encourage its passage.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

In closing, we are pleased to support this, but I would reiterate my personal concern, and I believe the concern of our side of the aisle, that as we save, as the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] has pointed out, \$500,000, or thereabouts, from the Clerk's office, and we transfer the responsibility of unified point of entry and first entry into the FEC, it is, I think, agreed on both sides that there will be an additional cost to the FEC.

We have provided, by correspondence more than legislation, that of the \$1.5 million for computerization, a portion of that can be used for the purposes of carrying out this additional responsibility that we transfer from the Clerk's office to the FEC.

We have no opposition to that, but I would like to observe that we must carefully review the capacity of the FEC to do those things which the public expects it to do. This will be a step in the right direction. But it will only be a step in the right direction if they have the capacity to do the job from an administrative standpoint, enter the data properly, have it accessible easily, and be able to respond to the public's questions.

I will be looking as a member of both the authorizing and the appropriating subcommittees that have responsibility to oversee FEC at the impact that this additional responsibility has on them with a view next year to make sure that they have sufficient funds to carry out what the American public believe to be an absolutely essential task of knowing where money comes from, where it goes, and what relationship, if any, it has to policy.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I know the gentleman from Maryland did not mean to misspeak in his concluding comments, but this is not an additional responsibility for the FEC. The FEC now has the responsibility to receive and record all campaign reports.

This is a timing question. Because, notwithstanding current procedure, where the campaign reports are filed with the Clerk of the House first, they are nevertheless still eventually transferred to the FEC. So this is not, I repeat, not an additional responsibility for the FEC. It is merely a question of timing.

The FEC enjoyed, as we say, the float. The fact that the Clerk was the one who received at the appropriate deadline the reports, enabled the FEC to buy some time to do other work that was required under the law by the deadline and then begin to receive, 1 to 3 days after the deadline, the materials from the Clerk.

This procedure could have been changed in any previous Congress. But it was convenient for folk. It was useful to have a system for holding reports in an area where that report could be retrieved by candidates, to be changed, to be reviewed, and then submitted to the FEC.

It seems to me the fundamental responsibility is the deadline and the public's right to know. The practice that H.R. 2527 eliminates is that float time. It does away with the convenience that the FEC had for a number of years of not having to deal with its responsibilities at the given deadline.

So when we talk about costs to the FEC, quite frankly this is something that should have been corrected a long time ago.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCINNIS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2527, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.



## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2527, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT  
AMENDMENTS OF 1995

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2204) to extend and reauthorize the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2204

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

## SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Defense Production Act Amendments of 1995".

## SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF PROGRAMS.

Section 717(a) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2166(a)) is amended in the first sentence by striking "Title I (except section 104), title III, and title VII (except sections 708, 714, 719, and 721) of this Act, and all authority conferred thereunder shall terminate at the close of September 30, 1995" and inserting "Title I (except section 104), title III, and title VII (except sections 708 and 721), and all authority conferred thereunder, shall terminate at the close of September 30, 1998".

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR  
TITLE III PROJECTS.

Section 711 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2161) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking "(a) AUTHORIZATION.—" and all that follows through "subsection (c).," and inserting "(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Except as provided in subsection (b)."; and

(2) by striking subsections (b), (c), and (d) and inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

"(b) TITLE III AUTHORIZATION.—There are authorized to be appropriated for each of the fiscal years 1996, 1997, and 1998, such sums as may be necessary to carry out title III."

## SEC. 4. REPORTS TO THE CONGRESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall prepare and transmit to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate an interim report and a final report on proposed legislative modernization of the authorities contained in the Defense Production Act of 1950.

(b) TIMING.—The President shall so transmit—

(1) the interim report required by subsection (a), not later than January 31, 1997; and

(2) the final report required by subsection (a), not later than September 30, 1997.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. FLAKE] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE].

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill before us today, H.R. 2204, a basically noncontroversial measure to extend and reauthorize the Defense Production Act of 1950. In this, I am grateful to enjoy the support of Representative JAMES A. LEACH, chairman of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services. In true bipartisan spirit, our distinguished former chairman, Representative GONZALEZ and Representative FLAKE, the ranking member of the subcommittee have also provided their strong support for this legislation and I am very appreciative of their efforts. I would be remiss if I did not also acknowledge the valued input provided by Representative METCALF, Representative BARR, Representative CHRYSLER, and Representative WATT of the subcommittee. Their counsel has served to improve the future exercise of Defense Production Act authorities.

Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy of the House Banking and Financial Services Committee has primary jurisdiction over the Defense Production Act, which is the primary statute used for the mobilization of civilian efforts during national disasters in peacetime and in support of the national defense during periods of national emergency. The authorization for the DPA expired on September 30, 1995. This legislation would extend and reauthorize the DPA until September 30, 1998.

Title I of the DPA is designed to ensure that the Armed Forces of the United States can obtain the critical goods and services required to carry out their duties during wartime national emergencies and peacetime national disasters. It provides the President with the authority to establish an order of precedence among contracts and to require that those contracts or orders for essential goods, necessary to the national defense, take precedence over other contracts or orders. In addition, title I authorizes the President to manage the allocation of materials, equipment, and services necessary to promote the national defense.

The fiscal year 1995 Defense Authorization Act redefined "national defense" and amended the DPA to extend the application of the authorities under title I to be used in the event of a national disaster. This is a sensible adaptation to permit these capabilities and authorities to be employed to help victims of natural disasters—floods, fires, hurricanes, and earthquakes.

These authorities have been employed to support the U.S. military in every conflict since 1950. Operation Desert Storm was a recent example of a conflict situation that arose with special needs that could not be com-

pletely anticipated and supplied through the ordinary operations of the market. Currently the Bosnian situation places actual and potential emergency equipment and logistical demands for the support of our forces.

Title III authorizes the President to use incentives to establish, expand, and maintain domestic production capacity for critical components, critical items of technology, and essential industrial resources required for the execution of the national security strategy of the United States.

No appropriations for DPA have been requested by this administration for fiscal year 1996 and none are forecast for fiscal year 1997. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that H.R. 2204 would result in additional outlays of \$80 to \$85 million over the 5-year period between 1996–2000. All of these costs would be subject to discretionary appropriations. The bill is not subject to pay as you go procedures because it would not affect direct spending or receipts. Enactment of this bill will have no effect on the budgets of State and local governments.

Mr. Speaker, the administration and the minority support this extension of the DPA through September 30, 1998. The other body has already passed substantially identical legislation by unanimous consent. This bill is a provident and careful provision for the unpredictable conflict or national emergency. I urge its immediate adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the chairman of the Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy, as well as the many members on both sides of the committee and in the House who realize the importance of the Defense Production Act to our national security.

Mr. Speaker, preparedness has long been a staple of our Nation's military strength. It is an unrefuted fact that our Nation's defense is grounded upon a policy of a strong industrial and technology base capable of meeting national defense requirements, and is further predicated upon our maintaining technological superiority on the battlefield. The synergy of these two themes is affirmed in the Defense Production Act.

More importantly, however, the authorities contained in the act make our policy a reality. The DPA's authorities are unique in that they provide the Defense Department the ability to maintain a strong domestic base which will be responsive to threats to the national security of the United States. Moreover, I am pleased to say these same authorities may apply in times of natural disasters here at home.

Mr. Speaker, a brief history of the DPA is in order, so that the American

public can understand the efficacy of its provisions. Established in 1950, the original intent was to mobilize the Nation's production capacity in response to material shortages experienced during World War II and the outbreak of the Korean war. Only three out of seven titles remain in operation today, and these authorities expired on September 30, 1995.

Title I is a powerful tool that ensures that our Armed Forces and those of our allies can obtain the materials they need to meet any contingency that threatens the national security. These priorities and allocations authorities have been used extensively and have proven invaluable. During Desert Storm, title I ensured that industry provided priority production and shipment of essential items urgently needed by the coalition forces. Close to 600 cases were handled during the conflict which included delivery of: Global positioning system receivers; activated charcoal for gas masks; and search/rescue radios.

Mr. Speaker, title III provisions also contain vital authorities. This "expansion of productive capacity and supply" authority allows the President to use incentives to establish, expand, or maintain domestic productive capacity for critical components, critical technology items, and industrial resources essential for the execution of the national security policy of the United States.

Title III provides a unique vehicle by which the Defense Department can provide financial incentives to industry to support defense needs. These incentives allow domestic industries to support and supply key advanced materials and technology items, and facilities the use of these materials in our Nation's defense systems. Most often these systems involve high technology systems including lasers, radar, and communication systems.

Mr. Speaker, the last operative authority, title VII, contains some general measures. I will close, however, by extending my support to the new language inserted requiring a report for possible changes to the active sections of the DPA. Members from both parties expressed concerns about the age of this law, and whether these authorities are obsolete. Some also felt that the President has too much power under the DPA. I believe the changes will assuage these concerns, and I look forward to working with Mr. CASTLE and the Defense Department on those changes.

Therefore, as the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy, I support the bill.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, for 45 years the Defense Production Act has provided the executive branch with essential authorities to ensure that our Armed Forces will have the materials and supportive services necessary to promote the national defense.

Ever since the Defense Production Act was enacted in 1950, the Banking Committee has carefully reviewed and amended the act so that it is as necessary today as the day it was enacted.

The bill before us today continues, until September 30, 1998, the President's authority to set procurement priorities on contracts for goods and services that are absolutely necessary for strategic military purposes. Additionally, the bill extends the President's authority to establish financial incentives to permit the domestic defense industry to produce goods and services which are critical elements of weapon systems.

While we recognize that we live in a global industrial environment, it simply makes no sense to depend on foreign sources of critical parts for U.S. weapon systems; no matter how strongly we believe another country shares our national interests. This legislation takes important steps to prevent an unreasonable reliance on the defense industries of other countries. The Defense Production Act produces jobs in American industries and promotes the development of new technologies for our firms.

I commend the chairman of the Banking Committee, Chairman LEACH, the subcommittee chairman and ranking member, Chairman CASTLE and Congressman FLOYD FLAKE respectively, for their work in bringing the bill to the floor.

I strongly recommend bipartisan support of the Defense Production Act Amendments of 1995.

□ 1500

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2204, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2204, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCINNIS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Delaware?

There was no objection.

#### PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN TRANSFERS OF NATIONAL FOREST LANDS

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 924) to prohibit the Secretary of Agriculture from transferring any na-

tional forest system lands in the Angeles National Forest in California out of Federal ownership for use as a solid waste landfill.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 924

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. PROHIBITION ON CERTAIN TRANSFERS OF NATIONAL FOREST LANDS.

After the date of the enactment of this Act the Secretary of Agriculture shall not transfer (by exchange or otherwise) any lands owned by the United States and managed by the Secretary as part of the Angeles National Forest to any person unless the instrument of conveyance contains a restriction, enforceable by the Secretary, on the future use of such land prohibiting the use of any portion of such land as a solid waste landfill. Such restriction shall be promptly enforced by the Secretary when and if a violation of the restriction occurs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN].

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 924 was introduced by Representative BUCK MCKEON and would prohibit the Secretary of Agriculture from transferring lands within the Angeles National Forest out of Federal ownership for use as a solid waste landfill. H.R. 924 addresses a concern raised by residents of southern California over efforts to construct a 190 million ton solid waste landfill in an area of the Angeles National Forest known as Elsmere Canyon. A private company is currently seeking to obtain 1,643 acres of land within the Angeles National Forest to facilitate construction of what would be the largest landfill in the United States. The Forest Service previously issued a recommendation against this exchange in a January 1995 draft environmental impact statement and also rejected a similar request made by the same company in 1986.

The Angeles National Forest is within a 2-hour drive of more than 20 million Californians and ranks second in the Nation in recreation use with 32 million visits annually. An enormous solid waste landfill, which the Forest Service has rejected on two occasions, is clearly not compatible with public use of the Angeles National Forest, which compromises 72 percent of the open space within Los Angeles County.

To sacrifice a prime area of the Angeles National Forest for a questionable landfill project is clearly not within the public's interest. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 924 and commend Mr. MCKEON for his success with this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.



Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] and the author of this bill, the gentleman from California [Mr. McKEON] have it about right. We agree with the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I am a cosponsor of H.R. 924. Representative McKEON asked myself and others to cosponsor this bill because of his deep concern that the placement of the proposed Elsmere Canyon solid waste landfill could negatively hit constituents and the local communities. It is obvious from the Resources Committee hearing that this proposed landfill is very controversial. The proposed landfill would be developed on land that is now part of the Angeles National Forest, land that would be acquired through a land exchange between the landfill operator and the Forest Service. While it appears highly likely that the proposed landfill will be rejected under the existing administrative procedures of the Forest Service, House passage of this legislation which will legislatively end any chance of this project going forward.

Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 924 and recommend its adoption by the House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. McKEON], the sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 924. This legislation would prohibit the Secretary of Agriculture from transferring land within the Angeles National Forest out of Federal ownership for use as a solid waste landfill. I introduced this bill in response to concerns raised by residents of southern California over efforts to construct a 190-million-ton solid waste landfill in the section of the Angeles National Forest known as Elsmere Canyon. I am also pleased that most of the Members from the California delegation have joined me in supporting this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, on at least two previous occasions the Forest Service has rejected proposals to construct a landfill within the Angeles National Forest. A similar proposal is currently under consideration where a private company would acquire through exchange 1,643 acres of land within the Angeles National Forest to facilitate construction of what would be the largest landfill in the country. The Forest Service has already issued a draft environmental impact statement that has recommended against accepting this exchange, and is in the process of completing a final report on this issue.

There are several reasons to support passage of this legislation today. As many southern Californians know, the Angeles National Forest is our version of Central Park, occupying 72 percent of the open land in Los Angeles County. In addition, the forest is within a 2-

hour drive for more than 20 million Californians and ranks second in the Nation in recreation use with more than 32 million annual visits—which is approximately equal to one visit per year for every person in California. Moreover, although the tract proposed for the landfill is on the western edge of the Angeles National Forest, it is an integral part of the forest's ecosystem and provides unique and spectacular educational and recreational opportunities for visitors to the forest. Finally, several tracts of land that the Forest Service is slated to acquire in an eventual exchange have already been obtained by the trust for public land through receipts act funding, which will reduce the value of an exchange to the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I am not involved in the issue to express arguments against landfills, since there are already several in my district. However, it is important to realize that the State of California is making great strides in promoting safer and more practical landfill alternatives. New developments in solid waste disposal technology already exist that will soon diminish the need for expensive and potentially unsafe new landfills. These technologies include combustion alternatives that do not adversely affect air quality as well as various recycling endeavors.

Mr. Speaker, all of us in this Chamber have a responsibility to protect public land which belongs to our citizens. To sacrifice a prime area of National Forest land for a questionable landfill project is clearly not in the public's interest. The legislation before us will carry out our intent to further prevent forever the construction of a landfill within the Angeles National Forest, and I urge its adoption.

Before concluding, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues who have supported this effort, especially my good friend, Mr. HANSEN, the chairman of the National Parks, Forests, and Lands Subcommittee as well as another friend, Mr. RICHARDSON, the ranking member of the subcommittee who is an original cosponsor of the legislation. I also want to express my appreciation to my colleague from California, Mr. MILLER the ranking member of the full committee and my friend from Alaska, Mr. YOUNG chairman of the full committee, for their efforts, along with the counsel of the National Parks Subcommittee, Allen Freemyer, and the subcommittee staff for their guidance and assistance throughout this process.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank my colleague and mentor, the gentleman from California [Mr. MOORHEAD]. He was the first Congressman I met in my life, and he has been a great example to me of what we should be in this House of the people. He represents the area covered in this bill and has been a great partner in getting to this point.

I express my appreciation also for the efforts of the residents of the city of Santa Clarita, CA, who have worked tirelessly to bring this issue to have the public's attention.

I urge support of this measure this day, H.R. 924.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. MOORHEAD].

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, this is a very important piece of legislation for the people of southern California. It is one that we have fought for a long period of time as we have fought against a trash dump that would destroy one of the most beautiful areas of southern California.

I do not think many people know it, but we have got the finest waterfall that I know of in southern California within Elsmere Canyon. It is a lovely area. It is an area that is adjacent to large population areas.

Our biggest problem in the national forest has been fires and the floods that followed. We have tried to provide recreational facilities for the people of southern California in those woods and forests that are a part of them. If a trash dump was built on this site, it would be a danger for fires. It would endanger the water supply of the people of Santa Clarita. It would endanger the quality of air that we have in that part of the county. It would not be a good place for a trash dump.

I am very, very grateful to the gentleman from California [Mr. McKEON] for bringing this legislation to this Congress. It is an area that I cherish and I want to keep pure, and I think that this legislation is the only thing that is going to do it.

I ask all Members to vote for this bill.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 924.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 924, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

# EXTENDING FEDERAL POWER ACT DEADLINE FOR CONSTRUCTION OF THREE ARKANSAS HYDRO-ELECTRIC PROJECTS

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 657) to extend the deadline under the Federal Power Act applicable to the construction of three hydroelectric projects in the State of Arkansas.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 657

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

## SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF DEADLINES.

Notwithstanding the time limitations of section 13 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 806) the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, upon the request of the licensee for FERC Project No. 4204, 4660, and 4659 (and after reasonable notice), is authorized, in accordance with the good faith, due diligence, and public interest requirements of such section 13 and the Commission's procedures under such section, to extend the time required for commencement of construction for the project for up to a maximum of 3 consecutive 2-year periods. This section shall take effect for the project upon the expiration of the extension (issued by the Commission under such section 13) of the period required for commencement of construction of such project.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SCHAEFER] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SCHAEFER].

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would extend the deadline for commencement of construction for three projects constituting the 21-megawatt White River Project in Arkansas for up to 6 years. The licensees for these projects, the city of Batesville and Independence County, have invested more than \$4 million in development. The licensees seek an extension because they have not been able to obtain a power sales contract. Construction of these projects will create new jobs for local residents and produce about \$300,000 in annual revenues for local governments. During construction, the licensees plan to spend more than \$12 million on wages and salaries, and nearly \$38 million on materials, providing further employment and income to local communities. The bill was introduced by our colleague, Representative LINCOLN of Arkansas. There is a need for congressional action, since the construction deadline for one of the projects ran out last week.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This is the first of eight bills that we will consider this afternoon that deal

with hydroelectric projects, and as the gentleman from Colorado mentioned, there has not been any objection to any of these bills.

The Federal Power Act allows the licensee 2 years to begin construction of a hydroelectric project once the license is issued and can extend that deadline but may do so only once and only for 2 years. However, there are many obstacles that make it difficult for projects to commence construction during either the initial license time frame or the extension time frame.

Perhaps the most frequent reason for delay is the lack of a power purchase agreement, for without such an agreement it is unlikely a project could get financed. Because of the limitations set in the Federal Power Act, the House has had a long bipartisan tradition of moving noncontroversial license extensions, and I am pleased we are continuing that tradition today with the gentleman from Colorado and myself and our subcommittee by taking up these bills that were reported, as I said, without dissent by the Committee on Commerce, and so I would ask that the first bill, H.R. 657, be considered.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SCHAEFER] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 657.

The question was taken.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 657, the bill just considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

## EXTENDING THE TIME FOR CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN FERC LICENSED HYDRO PROJECTS

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 680) to extend the time for construction of certain FERC licensed hydro projects.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 680

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

## SECTION 1. EXTENSION.

Notwithstanding the limitations of section 13 of the Federal Power Act, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, upon the request of the licensee or licensees for FERC projects numbered 4244 and 10648 (and after reasonable notice), is authorized in accordance with the good faith, due diligence, and public interest requirements of such section 13 and the Commission's procedures under such section, to extend the time required for commencement of construction for each of such projects for up to a maximum of 3 consecutive 2-year periods. This section shall take effect for the projects upon the expiration of the extension (issued by the Commission under such section 13) of the period required for commencement of construction of each such project.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SCHAEFER] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SCHAEFER].

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would extend deadlines for construction of two projects in New York with a capacity of 9.7 and 10.2 megawatts for up to 6 years, which would extend the deadline to up to 10 years after the date the licenses were issued. Adirondack Hydro Development Corp. is licensee for one of the projects, and general partner of the other. To date, the company has invested \$2 million in development of the projects. The licensee has not been able to begin construction because it has not been able to obtain a power sales contract needed to secure financing. Construction and operation of the projects offers substantial benefits to the community, including an estimated 180 jobs, a payroll expenditure of \$18 million, and a further \$20 million spent on local purchases of materials. This legislation was introduced by our colleague, Representative SOLOMON of New York. The construction deadline for one of these projects is January 16, 1996, so time is running short.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Colorado has explained the substance of the bill. It was reported out of our Subcommittee on Power and Energy and the full Committee on Commerce without objection. It is based on construction not having commenced for lack of a power-purchase agreement. I support the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SCHAEFER] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 680.



The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 680, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENDING FEDERAL POWER ACT DEADLINE FOR CONSTRUCTION OF AN OHIO HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1011) to extend the deadline under the Federal Power Act applicable to the construction of a hydroelectric project in the State of Ohio.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1011

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF DEADLINE.

Notwithstanding the time limitations of section 13 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 806) the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, upon the request of the licensee for FERC Project No. 9423 (and after reasonable notice), is authorized, in accordance with the good faith, due diligence, and public interest requirements of such section 13 and the Commission's procedures under such section, to extend the time required for commencement of construction for the project for up to a maximum of 3 consecutive 2-year periods. This section shall take effect for the project upon the expiration of the extension (issued by the Commission under section 13) of the period required for commencement of construction of such project.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SCHAEFER] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SCHAEFER].

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1011 would extend the deadline for construction of a 1,500-megawatt pumped-storage project in Ohio for up to 6 years, which would extend the deadline to up to 10 years after the date the license was issued. The licensee is Summit Energy Storage, Inc., which has been unable to commence construction because they have not obtained a power sales contract necessary to finance construction. To date, the licensee has invested more than \$20 million in project devel-

opment. The bill was introduced by our colleague, Representative SAWYER of Ohio. The deadline for commencement of construction ran out on April 11, 1995, and the license is subject to termination by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, so it is appropriate that we act on this bill today.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, again, this bill, which relates to hydroelectric projects in Ohio, was reported out of the subcommittee and the full committee without a dissenting vote. I urge support for the legislation.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1011, a bill I introduced this year to give the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission the authority to grant an extension of as much as 6 extra years for the construction of the Summit Pumped Storage Project in Norton, OH. I appreciate the assistance of Chairman SCHAEFER and Ranking Member PALLONE in bringing this legislation to the floor.

If constructed, the Summit facility would be capable of producing as much as 1,500 megawatts of electricity during hours of peak energy demand. The project itself would burn no fossil fuels, relying instead on hydroelectric generation to provide peak-load power. A 2.8 billion-gallon reservoir would partially empty into a network of abandoned limestone mines, passing through huge turbines on the way. The water would then be pumped back into the reservoir during the hours when electricity is cheapest.

Without H.R. 1011, this unique hydroelectric project will never be built. FERC, which granted the original construction license and a subsequent 2-year extension, is unable under existing law to grant any further extensions. Passage of this legislation will allow FERC to consider up to three 2-year license extensions. This legislation does not relieve the Summit project from the statutory and regulatory requirements it has previously had to meet. The licensing standards remain the same, and FERC will have the final word on the Summit project's eligibility to qualify.

Mr. Speaker, the Summit project enjoys strong support in northeastern Ohio, including the city of Norton, the mayor, and residents and businesses throughout the area. It is a project that will create hundreds of jobs for skilled workers throughout the region and will enhance ongoing economic development initiatives that are enormously important to Norton and the surrounding area.

Again, I'd like to express my thanks to the subcommittee for its work. I urge passage of H.R. 1011.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SCHAEFER] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1011.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1011, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

#### AUTHORIZING EXTENSION OF TIME LIMITATION FOR A FERC-ISSUED HYDROELECTRIC LICENSE

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1014) to authorize extension of time limitation for a FERC-issued hydroelectric license, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1014

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That notwithstanding the time limitation of section 13 of the Federal Power Act, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, upon the request of the licensee for FERC Project No. 3701, is authorized, in accordance with the good faith, due diligence, and public interest requirements of section 13 and the Commission's procedures under such section, to extend the time required for the licensee to commence the construction of such project for up to a maximum of 3 consecutive 2-year periods. This section shall take effect for the project upon the expiration of the extension (issued by the Commission under section 13) of the period required for commencement of construction of such project. If the license for FERC Project 3701 should expire prior to the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission is authorized and directed to reinstate effective June 1, 1995, the license previously issued for such project.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SCHAEFER] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SCHAEFER].

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would extend the deadline for construction of a 13.6-megawatt project in Washington for up to 6 years, which would extend the deadline for up to 10 years after the date the license was issued. The licensee is Yakima Tieton Irrigation District, which has been unable to begin project construction due to the lack of a power sales contract. To date, the licensee has paid more than \$380,000 for studies, investigations, and licensing of these project. The bill was introduced by our colleague, Representative

HASTINGS of Washington. The deadline for commencement of construction ran out on May 31, 1995, but H.R. 1014 provides for reinstatement of the license upon enactment, as well as extension of the construction deadline.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 1014. There was no objective to this bill relating to the project in Washington State.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HASTINGS], the author of the legislation.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1014. I want to thank my colleagues, the gentleman from Colorado, Chairman SCHAEFER, and the subcommittee's ranking member, Mr. PALLONE, for their expeditious handling of this important piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1014 is a non-controversial bill that merely extends the time limitation for a FERC-issued hydroelectric license for the Yakima-Tieton Irrigation District.

Located on the Tieton River in Yakima County, WA, the proposed project which began in the late 1970's calls for construction of a 13.6 megawatt hydroelectric project at the existing Tieton Dam.

In recent years, the irrigation district has entered into serious negotiations with Benton and Franklin County Public Utility Districts [PUD's] on a power purchase agreement.

These efforts culminated last year in meetings between the irrigation district, PUD's, underwriters, and bond counsel to discuss a formal memorandum of understanding [MOU].

It was determined, however, that a number of additional tasks must be completed before construction starts. The PUD's came to the conclusion that it was not feasible or realistic to meet these requirements by May 31, 1995, the most recent FERC deadline. Consequently, they have sought an extension for start of construction.

Project supporters tell me that if this deadline can be extended, a power purchase agreement could be worked out so that construction can be started as early as next fall.

H.R. 1014 simply extends the FERC deadline for completion of this license to May 31, 2001. When completed and paid for, the low cost, reliable power produced from this project would be available to serve the local area and would reduce power lost from wheeling over longer distances.

After repayment of revenue bonds, the benefits from power revenue would

go to reducing future operation and maintenance costs of the irrigation system. The project also provides many short term benefits for the public at large including construction of a nearby campground and enhanced recreational fishing.

Mr. Speaker, there is strong support within the local community for this legislation, which was unanimously approved by the House Commerce Committee last month. All funding will come from bonds secured by the Power Purchase Agreement. No Federal funding is required.

Again, I thank my colleagues for their assistance in making possible the passage of H.R. 1014. I strongly urge this House to vote in favor of this measure.

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SCHAEFER] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1014, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1014, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

#### PROVIDING FOR EXTENSION OF CERTAIN WEST VIRGINIA HYDROELECTRIC PROJECTS

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1051) to provide for the extension of certain hydroelectric projects located in the State of West Virginia.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1051

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF DEADLINE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the time period specified in section 13 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 806) that would otherwise apply to Federal Energy Regulatory Commission projects numbered 6901 and 6902, the Commission shall, upon the request of the licensee for those projects, in accordance with the good faith, due diligence, and public interest requirements of that section, the Commission's procedures under that section, and the procedures specified in that section, extend the time period during which the licensee is required to commence construction

of those projects so as to terminate on October 3, 1999.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—Subsection (a) shall take effect for the projects upon the expiration of the extension, issued by the Commission under section 13 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 806), of the period required for commencement of construction of the projects.

(c) REINSTATEMENT OF EXPIRED LICENSE.—If a license for a project described in subsection (a) has expired prior to the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall reinstate the license effective as of the date of its expiration and extend the time required for commencement of construction of the project until October 3, 1999.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SCHAEFER] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SCHAEFER].

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would extend the deadline for construction of two projects in West Virginia with a capacity of 37 and 35 megawatts until October 3, 1999, which would extend the deadline to 10 years after the date the licenses were issued. The licensee, the city of New Martinsville, has already invested about \$4 million in planning and permitting. Project construction has not yet commenced because the licensee has been unable to secure a power sales contract needed to finance construction. The benefits of these projects are substantial. The licensee estimates construction will cost about \$200 million and create hundreds of jobs. This bill was introduced by our colleague, Mr. MOLLOHAN of West Virginia. The construction deadlines for these projects have already run out, but H.R. 1051 provides for reinstatement of the licenses.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, these two projects have achieved bipartisan support. I urge adoption of the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SCHAEFER] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1051.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members



may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1051, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

#### REINSTATING THE PERMIT AND EXTENDING THE FEDERAL POWER ACT DEADLINE FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF AN OREGON HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1290) to reinstate the permit for, and extend the deadline under the Federal Power Act applicable to the construction of, a hydroelectric project in Oregon, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1290

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. REINSTATEMENT OF PERMIT EXTENSION DEADLINE.

Notwithstanding the expiration of the permit and notwithstanding the time period specified in section 13 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 806) that would otherwise apply to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission project numbered 7829, the Commission shall, at the request of the licensee for the project, reinstate the permit effective May 23, 1993, and extend the time period during which the licensee is required to commence the construction of the project so as to terminate on May 25, 1999.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SCHAEFER] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SCHAEFER].

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1290 would reinstate the license for a 1.9-megawatt project in Oregon effective May 23, 1993, and extend the deadline for construction to 10 years after the license was issued. The licensees for this project are the Talent, Rogue River Valley, and Medford irrigation districts. The licensees have not been able to begin construction, because of a lack of power sales contract needed to secure financing. This bill was introduced by our colleague, Representative COOLEY of Oregon. The license for this project was terminated by order of FERC on September 21, 1993, for failure to commence construction, but the bill would reinstate the license.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1530

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, the Democrats on the Committee on Commerce supported H.R. 1290 without objection.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCINNIS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SCHAEFER] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1290, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1290, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

#### PROVIDING FOR THE EXTENSION OF A WEST VIRGINIA HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1335) to provide for the extension of a hydroelectric project located in the State of West Virginia.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1335

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF DEADLINE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the time period specified in section 13 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 806) that would otherwise apply to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission project numbered 7307, the Commission shall, upon the request of the licensee for the project, in accordance with the good faith, due diligence, and public interest requirements of that section and the Commission's procedures under that section, extend the time period during which the licensee is required to commence construction of the project so as to terminate on September 26, 1999.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—Subsection (a) shall take effect for the project described in subsection (a) upon the expiration of the extension, issued by the Commission under section 13 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 806), of the period required for commencement of construction of the project.

(c) REINSTATEMENT OF EXPIRED LICENSE.—If a license for the project described in subsection (a) has expired prior to the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall reinstate the license effective as of the date of its expiration and extend the time required for commencement of construction of the project until September 26, 1999.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SCHAEFER] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] will be recognized for 20 minutes each.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SCHAEFER].

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1335 would extend the deadline for construction of a 20 megawatt project in West Virginia until September 26, 1999, or 10 years after the date the license was issued. The licensee for this project is the city of Grafton. The city has been unable to commence construction due to the lack of a power sales contract needed to secure financing for construction. This bill was introduced by our colleague, Representative MOLLOHAN of West Virginia. The construction deadline ran out on April 15, 1995, so it is appropriate that we act today. H.R. 1335 provides for reinstatement of the license upon enactment.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I also support H.R. 1335 and urge its adoption, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SCHAEFER] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1335.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1335, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

#### AUTHORIZING EXTENSION OF TIME LIMITATION FOR FERC-ISSUED HYDROELECTRIC LICENSE FOR MOUNT HOPE WATERPOWER PROJECT

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1366) to authorize the extension of time limitation for the FERC-issued hydroelectric license for the Mount Hope waterpower project.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1366

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FERC PROJECT.

Notwithstanding the time limitations specified in section 13 of the Federal Power

Act (16 U.S.C. 806), the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, upon the request of the licensee for FERC Project No. 9401 (and after reasonable notice), is authorized, in accordance with the good faith, due diligence, and public interest requirements of such section 13 and the Commission's procedures under such section, to extend the time required for commencement of construction of such project until August 3, 1999.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SCHAEFER] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] will be recognized for 20 minutes each.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SCHAEFER].

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1366 would extend the deadline for construction of a 2,000 megawatt pumped-storage project in New Jersey until August 3, 1999, or 7 years after the date the license was issued. The licensee is Halecrest Co., which has been unable to commence project construction due to the lack of a power sales contract needed to secure financing. This bill was introduced by our colleague, Representative FRELINGHUYSEN of New Jersey.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], my colleague, who is the sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time, and I rise in strong support of H.R. 1366, legislation I introduced earlier this year to extend the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission [FERC] license for the Mount Hope hydroelectric project by a period of 3 years. I would like to thank Chairman DAN SCHAEFER and ranking Member FRANK PALLONE of the Energy and Power Subcommittee for moving this bill expeditiously through their committee.

Mount Hope received its original FERC license in August 1992. The license has since been extended by 2 years and is due to expire in August 1996. H.R. 1366 would simply ensure that there is sufficient time for Mount Hope to secure the energy supply contracts needed to begin construction of the proposed facility.

The Mount Hope project is a proposed advanced pumped-storage hydroelectric plant located in Morris County, N.J. Far from a conventional hydro plant, the Mount Hope facility will be a closed-cycle system in which water will continuously circulate between two man-made reservoirs: an upper reservoir on the surface and a lower reservoir to be constructed entirely underground. During periods of peak electrical demand or when needed by the regional power pool to enhance system operations, water will be released from the upper reservoir into a vertical shaft which will direct it to the power-

house 2800 feet underground. There it will pass through a new generation of fast-response turbines which will be capable of reaching the full generating capacity of 2000 megawatts in as little as 15 seconds—a capability unmatched by any other method of power generation currently available. The water will then be stored in the underground lower reservoir.

The project has the strong support of local government officials and organizations, including the mayor of Rockaway Township, NJ, where the project will be built, the New Jersey Business and Industry Association and the Sierra Club of New Jersey. The \$1.8 billion project will be financed entirely by the private sector with no taxpayer dollars used for its construction or operation. It is estimated that the project will bring 1300 jobs to New Jersey and boost our Nation's economy by adding approximately \$6 billion to the gross national product during construction. It will also inject an estimated \$254.4 million directly into the Morris County economy in the form of wages and salaries and contractor spending.

In a nutshell, the project can serve as our region's long-term energy insurance policy by enhancing the security of the regional electrical supply system, thus allowing optimized use of existing generating and transmission facilities. Its rapid-response capability and its purchase of pump-up power during off-peak periods would allow existing thermal plants to operate more efficiently and cost-effectively by enabling them to run for longer periods of time at constant output levels.

This, along with increased transmission capacity, would facilitate compliance with the 1990 Clean Air Act amendments. A recent analysis by Tech Environmental Inc. estimated that typical operating profile of Mount Hope would result in a reduction of 13.4 tons of NO<sub>x</sub> per day. Assuming advanced operation of Mount Hope, it is estimated that NO<sub>x</sub> emissions could be reduced by 50 tons per day.

Mr. Speaker, as you can see the Mount Hope project has many environmental, energy and economic benefits for the State of New Jersey and the Mid-Atlantic region. The project has the strong support of local and State officials and organizations and will help us meet goals of the Clean Air Act. I urge my colleagues to support the passage of H.R. 1366 so that we can realize the benefits this exciting project promises.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to congratulate my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], for his hard work on this bill. As usual, he is out there working hard for his constituents.

The sponsors of this project have worked very hard to address some ini-

tial environmental concerns that arose with the project and their hard work has paid off. Today, I know of no objection to this project, and I am, therefore, pleased to add my support for the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SCHAEFER] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1366.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1366, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. RIGGS] at 5 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3 to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 115) "A joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes."

#### TEMPORARY INCREASE IN THE STATUTORY DEBT LIMIT—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 104-132)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:



*To the House of Representatives:*

I am returning herewith without my approval H.R. 2586, a bill that would provide a temporary increase in the public debt limit while adding extraneous measures that have no place on legislation of this kind.

This bill would make it almost inevitable that the Government would default for the first time in our history. This is deeply irresponsible. A default has never happened before, and it should not happen now.

I have repeatedly urged the Congress to pass promptly legislation raising the debt limit for a reasonable period of time to protect the Nation's creditworthiness and avoid default. Republicans in the Congress have acknowledged the need to raise the debt limit; the budget resolution calls for raising it to \$5.5 trillion, and the House and Senate voted to raise it to that level in passing their reconciliation bills.

This bill, however, would threaten the Nation with default after December 12—the day on which the debt limit increase in the bill would expire—for two reasons:

First, under this bill, on December 13 the debt limit would fall to \$4.8 trillion, an amount \$100 billion below the current level of \$4.9 trillion. The next day, more than \$44 billion in Government securities mature, and the Federal Government would be unable to borrow the funds to redeem them. The owners of those securities would not be paid on time.

Second, the bill would severely limit the cash management options that the Treasury may be able to use to avert a default. Specifically, it would limit the Secretary's flexibility to manage the investments of certain Government funds—flexibility that the Congress first gave to President Reagan. Finally, while the bill purports to protect benefit recipients, it would make it very likely that after December 12, the Federal Government would be unable to make full or timely payments for a wide variety of Government obligations, including interest on the public debt, Medicare, Medicaid, military pay, certain veterans' benefits, and payments to Government contractors.

As I have said clearly and repeatedly, the Congress should keep the debt limit separate from the debate over how to balance the budget. The debt limit has nothing to do with reducing the deficit; it has to do with meeting the obligations that the Government has already incurred.

Nevertheless, Republicans in the Congress have resorted to extraordinary tactics to try to force their extreme budget and priorities into law. In essence, they have said they will not pass legislation to let the Government pay its bills unless I accept their extreme, misguided priorities.

This is an unacceptable choice, and I must veto this legislation.

The Administration also strongly opposes the addition of extraneous provisions on this bill. Items like habeas corpus and regulatory reform are matters that should be considered and debated separately. Extraneous issues of this kind have no place in this bill.

The Congress should pass a clean bill that I can sign. With that in mind, I am sending the Congress a measure to raise the permanent debt limit to \$5.5 trillion as the Congress called for in the budget resolution, without any extraneous provisions.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, November 13, 1995.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and the message and bill will be printed as a House document.

PRIVILEGED MOTION OFFERED BY MR. ARCHER

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RIGGS). The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ARCHER moves that further consideration of the message and the bill, H.R. 2586, be postponed until December 12, 1995.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS], and pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this morning President Clinton vetoed the short-term debt limit extension sent to him by Congress. Had he signed our good faith effort at compromise, the confusion regarding the Government's ability to pay its bills would be at an end. By now, we are aware that the President's true reason for vetoing this bill is that he does not want to negotiate a balanced budget over 7 years as we do.

Mr. Speaker, he is taking any action he can to avoid negotiating with our leadership on a balanced budget. Let me outline what the President said no to when he refused to sign H.R. 2586 into law.

He said no to extending the debt limit date to December 12, at the level requested by his own Treasury Department. This would have allowed certainty in the financial markets and payments of bills and benefit checks on time without disruption.

The President also said no to the protections for Social Security and other Federal trust funds included in the temporary increase. Most Americans watching the debate must be wondering why a President would object to protecting their requirement investments. They paid into these funds for a specific purpose, to receive benefits when they become eligible, but the President does not want to protect these trust funds because he now needs

the investments in these accounts to get around the debt ceiling law and resist the call for budget negotiations.

Mr. Speaker, these trust fund protections are essential, because the Treasury Department announced today their intentions to raid the civil service trust fund and the G Fund and I must say, the G Fund is moneys that belong to Federal employees that have been invested for savings. He is to do this as a circuit breaker to avoid breaching the debt limit.

In fact, Treasury will have to auction enough securities to raise the \$102 billion needed later this week to pay off its obligations, and those moneys will come from disinvesting the two funds that I mentioned.

But this circuit breaker is really a high-voltage wire that directly taps into the retiree trust funds. There is nothing to prevent the administration from using these assets, and the assets of Social Security, to fund the Government during this debt limit interruption caused by the President's veto.

Current law does not protect the Social Security trust fund, and the provisions in our legislation that he vetoed do protect the Social Security trust fund. Mr. Speaker, the question is, what will Treasury do next week? Make no mistake, the President, by his veto, has put the Social Security trust fund at risk. If the President had done the responsible thing and signed this bill into law, there would be no financial disruptions, no beneficiary would be worried about a raid on their benefit trust fund.

Mr. Speaker, the administration may have vetoed this bill, but the steps it takes to get around the legal limits on borrowing will be closely watched, by us and by the people of this country. If assets are taken from the funds, we will know about it, and only we stand ready to protect retirees, and other benefits, unlike this administration.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the President and to everyone in this Chamber again, the time for delay has passed. No more excuses. We must stop passing our generation's debt on to our children and to our grandchildren. We must face the facts, do the responsible thing, even though it is tough, and bring our budget into balance.

The President must come to the table and negotiate in good faith on a plan to balance the budget in 7 years, based on real numbers, not his in-house manufactured numbers, without any tax increases.

Mr. Speaker, there are no preconditions, we say to the President. That is our goal and we will not be deterred.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] for yielding

me time. I appreciate the time and I am sorry we are not taking the full hour on this, but I can understand the reason why the Republicans just do not want this debated very much.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] looks real nice today. I know the gentleman had to work all weekend and I am sorry about that, but all of us Democrats were excluded from those conferences. So, all of this delay really cannot be blamed on us, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the real reason we are here today, and under these unusual circumstances, is that the Speaker just has not managed the Congress in the appropriate way. He has not even managed his Republican Party, which he is the leader of, in the appropriate way.

This debate should have been out of the way way back in July, July of this year, some 5 months ago. There is no reason for us taking it up today. It should have been done then, had we been functioning as we should have functioned.

But, Mr. Speaker, there was a different agenda and all kinds of radical ideas had to be explored out there. We never got down to business and taking care of what the President has just vetoed.

Why did he veto it? He vetoed this because it was a blackmail attempt upon him to try to make him accept, on behalf of the American public, a 25-percent increase in Medicare premiums, which would cost every one of the 40 million American Medicare recipients \$151.20 a year, or about \$300 for the average Medicare couple. So that is why he did not do this.

Mr. Speaker, this bill had all kinds of other things added on in addition to just lifting the debt ceiling and increasing the Medicare payments.

□ 1715

It had all kind of bells and whistles. Every radical idea the Republicans could jam on it that they knew could not stand on their own, but they could kind of try to hijack it through the Congress and get the President to sign it, because he wanted to shut the Government down.

Now, the President has other constitutional powers. I am glad that the Secretary of the Treasury is going to take some of the money. I have put 8.5 percent of my pay into the Federal retirement program for 33 years. I am proud the President is going to use some of that to keep this Government going. The law requires us to put all the money back so the Federal retirees are not going to lose a penny.

I have got all my savings, practically, in the G fund bonds that are going to have to be used tomorrow. But the law requires that that money has to be paid back, and I am not going to lose anything because I am using my money and other retirees' money to

pay for the Government operations. The Republicans just simply refuse to pay. They have incurred the bills. They have written the checks. But they want the checks to bounce. That is not fair. That is not American. That is not sound business. Standard & Poor's is already warning us today, today our credit rating has suffered. The Europeans have warned us today that our credit rating has suffered. Why? Because the Republicans cavalierly, cavalierly try to blackmail the President into signing something that no decent President would sign. That is what this is about.

Now, tonight at 8 p.m. we are going to have the first meeting of the budget bill conferees. The budget bill should have been adopted in July. Here it is November 13 and the budget bill conferees have not even met. But they got it all rigged up. The Republican leaders have decided we are going to meet in a pro forma session over in the Senate and they are going to jam it through. They have got the votes. They can do anything they want to around here. But they cannot even do that, they are fighting amongst themselves so much.

So we will send this ill-fated, ill-designed, radical budget conference down to the President, and he is going to veto that. And they will come back here whimpering and whining and complaining that he will not deal with us; he will not deal with us.

If they would get their work done and get their legislation down there for him to consider, then there is plenty of time for reasonable people to sit down and to try to work things out.

But we are running 6 months, 5 months behind time because of mismanagement, Mr. Speaker, on the House, on your part, Mr. Speaker. You are the manager of this House. You schedule the floor operations. You know when we are supposed to have things done, and you just have not done your job. The American people are not going to suffer for it because the President is going to save them from it by invading those trust funds. And all the money will be put back in the trust funds.

Thank goodness, the President has that authority, but the Republicans, as you know, Mr. Speaker, tried to take that away from him, too, in the bill that they just vetoed.

Now, the motion here is to put off this veto until December 12. Why not vote on it right now? We are all in Washington. We are right here. We could vote on it tonight. We could vote on it in 5 minutes. But I do not have the authority to call it up. Only you, Mr. Speaker, have the authority to call it up and to schedule it and let it come to the floor.

Why are the American people faced with another delay, just another Washington delay? Republican politics. That is all it is, to cover the mismanage-

ment that the Republicans have inflicted upon this Government and upon this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RIGGS). The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] has consumed 6 minutes and has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this motion. Last week we offered this House an opportunity, not once but on two different occasions, to give Congress and the administration a 30-day breathing space to resolve our budget differences, without risking the credit record it has taken our country 200 years to build. Our motion would have accomplished this goal in the same manner we have raised the debt limit in the past for both Democratic and Republican Presidents. That is, for short periods of time, without partisan riders and without putting this country in danger of default. A clear bill.

We have before us today an acknowledgment by the Republican leadership of this House that a 30-day period is exactly what this Congress needs, to give us time to work in a bipartisan way to develop a plan that will balance the Federal budget. However, rather than giving ourselves this breathing space in a responsible manner, by sending to the President a clean, temporary increase in the debt limit, the Republican leadership has decided to press political brinksmanship to its limit.

The pending motion would delay action on the President's veto for 30 days, but without increasing the debt limit in the meantime. What this means for the country is that it would force the Treasury Department to begin fiscally untried maneuvering in order to keep this country from defaulting on its debt. I simply believe forcing our Treasury Department to conduct the business of the Federal Government in this manner is irresponsible on the part of this Congress.

Although I know some believe there is no harm in setting up this showdown, we have already seen some of the potential fallout. Both Standard & Poor's and Moody's, two of the world's leading credit-rating agencies, have issued warnings that our Government's triple-A credit rating is at risk, and that the faith of investors has already been diminished by the threat of default. IBCA, the European credit rating agency, has placed the United States on rating watch for a possible downgrade of its triple-A foreign and local currency long-term credit ratings.

If these down-gradings were to go into effect, the impact would place a huge additional burden on our taxpayers, and would last well beyond the current controversy.



I urge my colleagues to set aside partisan differences and do the right thing for the American people. Let's defeat this motion and give ourselves the 30-day window the responsible way, by providing for a temporary increase in the debt limit that is free of partisan distractions and get to work on the balanced budget. A balanced budget without raising taxes is a goal that has bipartisan backing. Let us get on with the business of reaching that goal in a bipartisan manner, and put our fiscal house in order for ourselves and for future generations.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, simply to respond to my friend from Virginia. He should know that defeating this motion does nothing to accomplish what he is talking about. This motion is strictly designed to determine what the House does with the veto and is not relative to any possible new plan. The President has already shut the door on the plan that we believe is responsible.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ENGLISH].

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise with great regret. On Saturday Congress sent the President a bill that would have extended the statutory debt limit, while at the same time protecting the trust funds such as Social Security, Civil Service, and Medicare, from being disinvested during a so-called debt limit crisis. Unfortunately, the President decided to veto the bill. Why? Because it would have prevented the Secretary of the Treasury from gaming the trust funds during a debt limit crisis, from raiding Social Security, from tapping the pension funds of Federal retirees.

Mr. Speaker, I am extremely disappointed in the President's decision to veto the debt limit extension bill. It sends a terrible message, the wrong message to all of those on Social Security.

The President's veto tells the 43 million Americans who get Social Security and the 140 million workers who pay into it that it is okay to use the \$483 billion in assets from that trust fund as a pawn on the President's political chessboard and that it is okay to play games with the \$30 billion payroll taxes that workers pay in each month and that retirees rely on to finance their benefit checks.

The President's veto is an open declaration that he plans to have the Secretary of the Treasury tap trust fund assets to circumvent the debt limit. This assault on the public's confidence in these trust funds is fair game.

Mr. Speaker, as a result of what has happened in 1985, the Social Security trust funds lost \$382 million in interest, and long-term bonds were cashed in early. Congress later passed legislation to restore the lost interest and recon-

struct the bond portfolio, but no legislation could ever restore the public confidence that was lost.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire about the time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] has 6 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] has 8 minutes remaining.

Let the Chair clarify that that is of the original, the original time yielded by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER].

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes and 30 seconds to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COLLINS].

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that the President has vetoed a measure that we felt would extend the borrowing power of the Treasury for a short period of time in order for us to get through this budget reconciliation process. The reason I regret that he has vetoed it is because of the protection in the proposal that we sent to him pertaining to the trust funds.

I do not know how many hall meetings that I have held over the last 2½ to 3 years in Georgia in the 3d District and how many people in groups that I have spoken to during that same period of time that when I open it up for questions I always have people say and ask me, MAC, is there really a Social Security trust fund or is it just a drawer filled with IOU's? I regret to tell them that really it is both.

There is a Social Security trust fund. It is kind of a bookkeeping procedure where we track the amount of money that comes in through the Treasury for Social Security. But the fact of the matter is that all of those funds have been loaned to the Treasury. In fact today it is close to 2,500 billion dollars' worth of moneys that is owed by the Treasury to that trust fund.

As I spoke just last week and did some research on the other funds, out of the \$4.9 trillion of debt that we have created for the taxpayers, \$1.250 trillion of it is actually owed to trust funds, almost \$500 billion to Social Security, over \$300 billion to the Civil Service, \$112 billion to VA, 129 billion to the Medicare part A. It just goes on and on.

It is time that we stopped that. It is time that we put those funds aside as we have told people we are going to do. They have invested into those trust funds. They are waiting to use them in the latter days of their lives, looking forward to retirement. It is just not right to continue borrowing against those funds as we are doing it.

I have no problem with the Treasury actually borrowing funds, but I want it to be arm's length as it would be any other investor who would take their funds and make an arm's length pur-

chase of T bills. But to just say, we are going to ignore protection of those trust funds, we are just going to use them no matter what the Congress wants done, no matter what the people want done, we are just going to use them at our will. I think that is absolutely wrong. I regret that the President has chosen this route and hopefully that we will be able to come to some consideration and agreement on the reconciliation bill soon.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, again, I have to come and say I do not understand why we are here. The people are very confused as evidenced by the telephone calls coming to my district.

I hear very rational speeches as my good friend from Georgia just made and which I sit and say, I agree with him. That is part of the problem. One of the things the people are saying to us today is no more business as usual. This amendment, this vote today is the best example of business as usual as I have seen in a long time. It does the very things we all decry, at least what I am hearing today.

If I could just in 1 minute try to make it clear to everyone who is wondering what are we doing.

□ 1730

No. 1, we should not be putting the good faith and credit of the United States at risk, playing political games, no matter what our end goals are.

No. 2, we keep hearing, "Balanced budget, balanced budget. That's why we're doing it." There are over 300 Members of this body from both sides of the aisle that have already agreed with our vote and intend to, with our actions, show that that will be done in a time certain. Is it too much to ask of the majority to let that work, to send a clean debt ceiling to the President and then send the budget that we are talking about that has not even been completed, that is going to be conferenced for the first time tonight? Is it too much to ask of the majority, and all of us, in a bipartisan way to send a clean debt ceiling, to not muck around with the debt, the good faith and credit of the United States? Send him a clean one? Get on with doing the people's business? Have the House and Senate act, have the President veto, and then let us get on with the necessary compromising that is going to be necessary in order for us to accomplish what I believe an overwhelming majority of the House wants us to do?

No more business as usual. Let us defeat this resolution, and let us get on with doing the House's work as we were elected to do.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to engage the gentleman from Texas in a colloquy, if he would return to the microphone.

The gentleman has said this motion is business as usual. Could the gentleman tell me what this motion is?

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARCHER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. STENHOLM. As I understand the motion before us, it is that we do nothing until December 12. In the meantime the gentleman and, I believe—

Mr. ARCHER. Do nothing on what?

Mr. STENHOLM. On the debt ceiling.

Mr. ARCHER. No, that is not the motion. That is not the motion. The gentleman obviously does not understand what he spoke to. This motion simply postpones the vote on an override of the debt ceiling. It should be clear to the gentleman that this will not be overridden, and so this motion is not business as usual. It is a simple procedural motion to postpone this vote until December 12.

Mr. STENHOLM. Would the gentleman allow me to respond?

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MCCREERY].

Mr. MCCREERY. Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman from Texas that what we are seeing with the administration is exactly business as usual, and I know that the gentleman is very concerned about balancing budget of this country. He has been a leader in that effort, and he should be concerned that the administration will use tricks, just as the ones that have stated in their veto message, to postpone for yet another year many budget reforms that we need to put in place now, not after the next Presidential election, now.

So that, sir, is why we insist on these measures.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, if it is now, why do we not vote now on the veto? Why delay?

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY].

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] is absolutely right. This is an effort to postpone the vote to override the veto until the 12th of the month, and it is obvious why that is, because neither body has the votes to override a veto at this time. So it seems to me very clear that we should be spending our time now making an effort to pass a clean, short-term debt ceiling and spend the time looking for the 218 votes to do just that.

Mr. Speaker, I say to you that while you might not be able to pass a debt ceiling on your side because there are those Members that want to have riders and want to have congressional conditions, then there also might be people on our side of the aisle that just are not ready to vote for the debt ceiling. However, I am convinced there are 218 Members ready to vote for a clean debt ceiling, and the President has said

he would sign one so when it is all said and done the debt ceiling will be increased. I think it could be increased tomorrow and we should not force the economy or the average American to watch this that is going on now which they all say it is all their fault and they do not understand what is going on.

Let us be clear. Raising the debt ceiling has nothing to do with the current level of spending or the reason why the Government would close down tomorrow. It has to do with financing prior obligations, debts owed, debts that should be paid. There is no doubt that the debt ceiling will be raised in the long run. We could do it in the short run.

So, that is exactly what we should be doing, looking for the votes to pass a clean debt ceiling that the President will sign.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have the utmost respect for the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM], and I know he has worked with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] and worked hard for balanced budget amendments, and he asked what is the problem, and he said that there is a time certain that we had 300 Members vote on a balanced budget. That is true. The Senate also passed a balanced budget. The American people want a balanced budget, but the President will not sign a balanced budget. The President said earlier that he was going to come up with a balanced budget in 5 years. Then he produced no budget, and then, after pressure, he produced a budget in 10 years to balance it, and it was a \$200-billion-a-year increase in the deficit.

The President does not want to balance the budget. Why? I say to my colleagues, "You want a clean debt ceiling, you want a clean CR. This Member is ready to give you one. Have the President sign a balanced budget in 7 years, and you get a clean one. I mean that's not too much to ask. You said you want a balanced budget, the Senate does, the American people. The only person that doesn't want it is the President, and that's what we're asking for."

The Republicans basically work with small business and big business. The Democrats basically work with people in the flow of Federal dollars, and that is about a pretty evil place here, Mr. Speaker, because what happens, it is about the ability to get reelected, the ability to spend money. The ability to spend money means the ability to increase taxes, which means the ability to get reelected because that flow of money goes downhill, and that has led up to \$5 trillion debt, and, if we take a look, every single appropriations bill, the gentleman that is speaking now

and almost every speaker on that side wants to increase the amount of appropriations except for one area the liberals in one area will cut every single time, and that is in national security at a time where increase in Somalia, and Haiti, and Bosnia have put us in a \$2 billion below the Bottom-up Review.

Yes, balance the budget, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is time to put your House in order, because, quite frankly, your House is a mess. You need to clean it up.

Republicans control the House. They control the Senate. Republicans make the rules. But what Republicans cannot seem to make—is policy. They cannot govern. They cannot lead.

We do not have a problem because Republicans cannot agree with Democrats. We do not have a problem because Congress cannot agree with the President. We have a problem because Republicans cannot agree among themselves. We have a problem because Republican leaders cannot lead.

So now we have this resolution—to do nothing. It is a do-nothing proposal. Mr. Speaker, this is not even leadership by default. It is a default of leadership.

The President has set his priorities. The message is clear. Send him a clean bill, and he will sign it. But he will not be blackmailed. The President will not give in to your extreme proposals.

We Democrats have set our priorities. All Democrats agree—do not cut education. Do not attack Medicare. Do not destroy the environment. Do not cut taxes for the rich—and raise taxes on millions of working families.

Because the Republicans cannot lead, this President will. Thank you, Mr. President, for leading. Thank you for saying no to the Republicans' mean-spirited, extreme proposal. Thank you for standing up for our working families, our parents, our children, and our grandchildren. Thank you for doing what the Republicans will not do. Thank you for leading. Thank you for doing what is right, what is fair, and what is just.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE], a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Trade.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished chairman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important for everybody to understand something, and it goes back to Government 101. It is basics. This body originates policy. Congress exclusively has the responsibility to make policy. The function at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue is to administer our policies, and the fact is further, if we go back to



the election in 1992, this gentleman got elected at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue with only 29 percent of the electorate. A majority of the American people in the most recent election said this is what we want, and we will provide it.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of our time to the gentleman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RIGGS). The gentleman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] is recognized for 1 minute.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I stand in opposition to this motion, and I ask the Republican leadership in this House to stop playing games with our country's financial future and send the President a clean bill that he can sign.

Since April, Speaker GINGRICH has been threatening to throw our Government into default if he did not get his way on the budget, despite the fact that the overwhelming majority of the American public is opposed to the Republican budget that cuts Medicare, cuts education, and cuts the environment. Take a look at what Speaker GINGRICH was saying in April: The President, and I quote:

will veto a number of things and we'll then put them all on the debt ceiling, and then he'll decide how big a crisis he wants.

Then in September Speaker GINGRICH was at it again, continuing his threats, and he said:

I don't care what the price is. I don't care if we have no executive offices and no bonds for 30 days, not at this time.

"I don't care what the price is." That says it all; does not it? It is the casual irresponsibility of this Speaker of the House of Representatives that tonight puts our country on the brink of default for the first time in this Nation's history.

Send the President a clean debt limit bill.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of our time to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, let us be clear what the President is doing. The President is planning on simply making a ledger entry that some portion of the \$1.4 trillion in Treasury IOU's held in the Federal trust funds is now simply a fictitious cash interest entry instead of a fictitious borrowing entry. This allows Treasury to increase borrowing from the public by the same amount as the disinvestment or underinvestment. Wednesday, Treasury will be about \$20 billion over the debt limit if it goes through with its announced auctions. This overage is going to increase to about \$50 billion in early December. Clearly the President will underinvest the G fund and disinvest part of the

civil service retirement fund in order to obtain additional borrowing authority.

Here is the point. In taking such action, the President is increasing the public debt of this country without the authority of Congress. The President has discovered a way to make his own legislation, to snub his nose at Congress and drive this country deeper into debt. Now there is approximately \$20 billion in the so-called G fund, approximately \$350 billion in the civil service retirement fund, \$440 billion in the Social Security trust fund. Using these three funds alone, the President could increase our marketable debt a trillion dollars or more. This makes a mockery of the people's ability to limit the amount of debt that this Government should issue. We should be looking at a new debt ceiling. Try to urge the President to come to the table and get on with the business of Government.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the President for vetoing the debt limit extension legislation and the continuing resolution. Clearly, the Congress should pass a fair and clean continuing resolution and debt limit extension free of extreme conditions.

The continuing resolution is necessary because the majority has spent much of this year working on their contract rather than passing the Nation's annual spending bills. Most of these bills are hopelessly tied up by legislative riders representing extreme views. Where is the moderation? Thankfully, the President is not willing to be blackmailed into accepting the misguided Republican budget priorities.

In particular, why should continuing funding for the Government be tied up over an attempt to impose an \$11 a month premium increase on every single Medicare beneficiary?

The Republican continuing resolution also cuts education programs 19 percent below the President's request. Funding for education reform is cut by 40 percent. Funding for safe and drug-free schools is cut by 40 percent. Funding for bilingual education is cut by 51 percent. Funding for research on special education is cut by 25 percent. These proposals are extreme.

In my view, rather than a highly partisan and ideological continuing resolution, a bipartisan approach would better serve the American people.

Mr. Speaker, let us vote on a clear and fair continuing resolution. Stop the blackmail.

□ 1845

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER].

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the

point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 184, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 788]

YEAS—223

Allard	Funderburk	Myers
Archer	Ganske	Myrick
Armey	Gekas	Nethercutt
Bachus	Gilchrest	Neumann
Baker (CA)	Gillmor	Ney
Baker (LA)	Gilman	Norwood
Ballenger	Goodlatte	Nussle
Barr	Goodling	Oxley
Barrett (NE)	Goss	Packard
Bartlett	Graham	Parker
Barton	Greenwood	Paxon
Bass	Gunderson	Petri
Bateman	Gutknecht	Pombo
Bereuter	Hancock	Porter
Blibray	Hansen	Portman
Bilirakis	Hastert	Pryce
Bliley	Hastings (WA)	Quillen
Boehlert	Hayworth	Quinn
Boehner	Hefley	Radanovich
Bonilla	Heineman	Ramstad
Bono	Herger	Regula
Brownback	Hillery	Riggs
Bryant (TN)	Hobson	Roberts
Bunn	Hoekstra	Rogers
Bunning	Hoke	Rohrabacher
Burr	Horn	Ros-Lehtinen
Burton	Hostettler	Roth
Buyer	Houghton	Roukema
Callahan	Hunter	Royce
Calvert	Hutchinson	Salmon
Camp	Hyde	Sanford
Canady	Inglis	Saxton
Castle	Istook	Schaefer
Chabot	Johnson (CT)	Schiff
Chambliss	Johnson, Sam	Seastrand
Chenoweth	Jones	Sensenbrenner
Christensen	Kasich	Shadegg
Chrysler	Kelly	Shaw
Clinger	Kim	Shays
Coble	King	Shuster
Coburn	Kingston	Skeen
Collins (GA)	Klug	Smith (MI)
Combest	Knollenberg	Smith (NJ)
Cooley	Kolbe	Smith (TX)
Cox	LaHood	Solomon
Crane	Largent	Souder
Crapo	Latham	Spence
Cremins	LaTourette	Stearns
Cubin	Laughlin	Stockman
Cunningham	Lazio	Stump
Deal	Leach	Talent
DeLay	Lewis (CA)	Tate
Diaz-Balart	Lewis (KY)	Taylor (NC)
Dickey	Lightfoot	Thomas
Doolittle	Linder	Thornberry
Dreier	Livingston	Tiahrt
Duncan	LoBiondo	Torkildsen
Dunn	Longley	Upton
Ehlers	Lucas	Vucanovich
Ehrlich	Manzullo	Walker
Emerson	Martini	Walsh
English	McCollum	Wamp
Ensign	McCrery	Watts (OK)
Everett	McDade	Weldon (FL)
Ewing	McHugh	Weldon (PA)
Fawell	McInnis	Weller
Fields (TX)	McIntosh	White
Flanagan	McKeon	Whitfield
Foley	Metcalfe	Wicker
Fowler	Meyers	Wolf
Fox	Mica	Young (AK)
Franks (CT)	Miller (FL)	Young (FL)
Franks (NJ)	Molinari	Zimmer
Frelinghuysen	Moorhead	
Frisa	Morella	

NAYS—184

Abercrombie	Baldacci	Beilenson
Ackerman	Barcia	Bentsen
Andrews	Barrett (WI)	Berman
Baessler	Becerra	Bevill

Bishop  
Bonior  
Borski  
Boucher  
Brewster  
Browder  
Brown (CA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brown (OH)  
Bryant (TX)  
Cardin  
Chapman  
Clay  
Clayton  
Clement  
Clyburn  
Coleman  
Collins (IL)  
Collins (MI)  
Condit  
Conyers  
Costello  
Coyne  
Cramer  
Danner  
Davis  
de la Garza  
DeFazio  
DeLauro  
Dellums  
Deutsch  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Dixon  
Doggett  
Dooley  
Doyle  
Durbin  
Edwards  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Evans  
Farr  
Fattah  
Fazio  
Flner  
Flake  
Foglietta  
Forbes  
Ford  
Frost  
Furse  
Gejdenson  
Gephardt  
Geren  
Gibbons  
Gonzalez  
Gordon

Green  
Gutierrez  
Hall (OH)  
Hall (TX)  
Hamilton  
Harman  
Hastings (FL)  
Hayes  
Hefner  
Hilliard  
Hinchey  
Holden  
Hoyer  
Jackson-Lee  
Jacobs  
Jefferson  
Johnson (SD)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnston  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kennelly  
Kildee  
Kleczka  
Klink  
LaFalce  
Lantos  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lincoln  
Lipinski  
Lofgren  
Lowey  
Luther  
Maloney  
Manton  
Martinez  
Mascara  
Matsui  
McCarthy  
McDermott  
McHale  
McNulty  
Meek  
Menendez  
Mfume  
Miller (CA)  
Minge  
Mink  
Mollohan  
Montgomery  
Moran  
Murtha  
Nadler  
Obey  
Oliver  
Ortiz

Orton  
Owens  
Pallone  
Pastor  
Payne (NJ)  
Payne (VA)  
Pelosi  
Peterson (FL)  
Peterson (MN)  
Pickett  
Pomeroy  
Poshard  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Richardson  
Rivers  
Roemer  
Rose  
Roybal-Allard  
Rush  
Sabo  
Sanders  
Sawyer  
Schroeder  
Schumer  
Scott  
Sisisky  
Skaggs  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stenholm  
Studds  
Stupak  
Tanner  
Taylor (MS)  
Tejeda  
Thompson  
Thornton  
Thurman  
Torres  
Torricelli  
Towns  
Traffant  
Velazquez  
Vento  
Visclosky  
Ward  
Waters  
Watt (NC)  
Wilson  
Wise  
Woolsey  
Wyden  
Wynn

## NOT VOTING—25

Blute  
Dornan  
Fields (LA)  
Frank (MA)  
Gallegly  
Kennedy (MA)  
McKinney  
Meehan

Moakley  
Neal  
Oberstar  
Reed  
Scarborough  
Serrano  
Smith (WA)  
Stokes  
Tauzin

Tucker  
Volkmer  
Waldholtz  
Waxman  
Williams  
Yates  
Zeliff

□ 1803

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mrs. Smith of Washington for, with Mr. Moakley against.

Mr. Dornan for, with Mr. Stokes against.

Messrs. McHUGH, EWING, and HOKE changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

# EXTENDING FEDERAL POWER ACT DEADLINE FOR CONSTRUCTION OF THREE ARKANSAS HYDRO-ELECTRIC PROJECTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KOLBE). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 657.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SCHAEFER], that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 657, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 404, nays 0, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No 789]

YEAS—404

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Allard  
Andrews  
Archer  
Armey  
Bachus  
Baesler  
Baker (CA)  
Baker (LA)  
Baldacci  
Ballenger  
Barcia  
Barr  
Barrett (NE)  
Barrett (WI)  
Bartlett  
Barton  
Bass  
Bateman  
Becerra  
Bellenson  
Bentsen  
Bereuter  
Berman  
Bevill  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Bishop  
Bliley  
Boehlert  
Boehner  
Bonior  
Bono  
Borski  
Boucher  
Brewster  
Browder  
Brown (CA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brown (OH)  
Brownback  
Bryant (TN)  
Bryant (TX)  
Bunn  
Bunning  
Burr  
Burton  
Buyer  
Callahan  
Calvert  
Canady  
Cardin  
Castle  
Chabot  
Chambliss  
Chapman  
Chenoweth  
Christensen  
Chrystler  
Clayton  
Clement  
Clinger  
Clyburn  
Coble  
Coburn  
Coleman  
Collins (GA)

Collins (IL)  
Collins (MI)  
Combest  
Condit  
Conyers  
Cooley  
Costello  
Cox  
Coyne  
Cramer  
Crane  
Crapo  
Creameans  
Cubin  
Cunningham  
Danner  
Davis  
de la Garza  
Deal  
DeFazio  
DeLauro  
DeLay  
Dellums  
Deutsch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dickey  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Dixon  
Doggett  
Dooley  
Doolittle  
Doyle  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Durbin  
Ehlers  
Ehrlich  
Emerson  
Engel  
English  
Ensign  
Eshoo  
Evans  
Hatch  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Hefner  
Heineman  
Heger  
Hilleary  
Hilliard  
Hinchey  
Hobson  
Hoekstra  
Hoke  
Holden  
Horn  
Hostettler  
Houghton  
Hoyer  
Hunter  
Hutchinson  
Hyde  
Ingalls  
Istook  
Jackson-Lee  
Jacobs  
Jefferson  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson (SD)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Johnston  
Jones  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kelly  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kennelly  
Kildee  
Kim  
King  
Kingston  
Kleczka  
Klink

Klug  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
LaFalce  
LaHood  
Lantos  
Largent  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Laughlin  
Lazio  
Leach  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Lightfoot  
Lincoln  
Linder  
Lipinski  
Livingston  
LoBiondo  
Lofgren  
Longley  
Lowey  
Lucas  
Luther  
Maloney  
Manton  
Manzullo  
Martinez  
Martinez  
Mascara  
Matsui  
McCarthy  
McCollum  
McCrery  
McDade  
McDermott  
McHale  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McIntosh  
McKeon  
McKinney  
McNulty  
Meek  
Menendez  
Metcalfe  
Meyers  
Mfume  
Mica  
Miller (CA)  
Miller (FL)  
Minge  
Mink  
Mollinari  
Mollohan  
Montgomery  
Moorhead  
Moran  
Morella  
Murtha  
Myers  
Myrick  
Nadler

Nethercutt  
Neumann  
Ney  
Norwood  
Nussle  
Obey  
Oliver  
Ortiz  
Orton  
Owens  
Oxley  
Packard  
Pallone  
Parker  
Pastor  
Paxon  
Payne (NJ)  
Payne (VA)  
Pelosi  
Peterson (FL)  
Peterson (MN)  
Petri  
Pickett  
Pombo  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Portman  
Poshard  
Pryce  
Quillen  
Quinn  
Radanovich  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Rangel  
Regula  
Richardson  
Riggs  
Rivers  
Roberts  
Roemer  
Rogers  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Rose  
Roth  
Roukema  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Rush  
Sabo  
Salmon  
Sanders  
Sanford  
Sawyer  
Schaefer  
Schiff  
Schroeder  
Schumer  
Scott  
Seastrand  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Shadegg  
Shaw  
Shays

Shuster  
Sisisky  
Skaggs  
Skeen  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Solomon  
Souder  
Spence  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stearns  
Stenholm  
Stockman  
Stokes  
Studds  
Stump  
Stupak  
Talent  
Tanner  
Tate  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Tejeda  
Thomas  
Thompson  
Thornberry  
Thornton  
Thurman  
Tiahrt  
Tirkildsen  
Torres  
Torricelli  
Towns  
Traffant  
Upton  
Velazquez  
Vento  
Visclosky  
Vucanovich  
Walker  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Ward  
Waters  
Watt (NC)  
Watts (OK)  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
White  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wilson  
Wise  
Wolf  
Woolsey  
Wyden  
Wynn  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)  
Zimmer

## NOT VOTING—28

Blute  
Camp  
Clay  
Dornan  
Edwards  
Fields (LA)  
Frank (MA)  
Franks (NJ)  
Gallegly  
Kasich

Kennedy (MA)  
Markey  
Meehan  
Moakley  
Neal  
Oberstar  
Reed  
Saxton  
Scarborough  
Smith (WA)

□ 1822

So (two-thirds having voted in the favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BLUTE. Mr. Speaker, due to the cancellation and rescheduling of my



flight from Boston, I was not present for rollcall votes 788 and 789. Had I been present I would have voted "aye" on rollcall 788 and "aye" on rollcall 789.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives considered a number of bills under suspension of the rules, and I missed two recorded votes.

During the consideration of legislation in the House, I was in California to attend the formal introduction of the International Institute for Surface Transportation Studies, an initiative that was created by Congress as part of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Infrastructure Act of 1991 (Public Law 102-240).

Had I had been present, I would have voted "nay" on the Archer motion to postpone the vote to override the President's veto on the debt limit legislation, rollcall vote No. 788, and I would have voted "aye" on H.R. 657, legislation to extend the Federal Power Act deadline for construction of three hydroelectric projects in Arkansas, rollcall vote No. 789.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent for rollcall votes 788 and 789 due to mechanical problems with my flight to Washington.

Mr. Speaker, had I not been detained, I would have voted "No" on rollcall vote 788 and "Yes" on rollcall vote 789.

#### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. KOLBE). Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, the pending business is the question de novo of agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

#### REQUEST TO DISCHARGE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 118, FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations be discharged from further consideration of House Joint Resolution 118, a clean continuing resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the guidelines that have been consistently issued and followed by this Speaker and previous Speakers of the House, and procedures recorded on page 534 of the House Rules Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the gentleman's request until it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I hope it is cleared by the other side sometime tonight.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT ON H.R. 2126, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of rule 28, clause 1(c), I am announcing that tomorrow I will offer a motion to instruct the House conferees on the bill, H.R. 2126, to insist on sections 8102 and 8111 of the House-passed bill.

As an explanation, by serving this notice I am ensuring the opportunity tomorrow to move to instruct the defense appropriation conferees to insist on the language that was in the House bill when it passed this body relative to Bosnia. This language would make certain that the President does not move ground troops into Bosnia without House approval, unless he comes before this body and explains thoroughly what the objective is, what vital United States interests are involved, et cetera.

#### LEGISLATION PROVIDING FOR INCREASE IN THE PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 104-133)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

#### To the Congress of the United States:

In disapproving H.R. 2586, a bill that would have, among other things, provided for a temporary increase in the public debt, I stated my desire to approve promptly a simple increase in the debt limit. Accordingly, I am forwarding the enclosed legislation that would provide for such an increase.

I urge the Congress to act on this legislation promptly and to return it to me for signing.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, November 13, 1995.

#### INQUIRING AS TO SCHEDULE FOR THE EVENING

(Mr. GEPHARDT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I would just hope that the majority would give Members a sense, as soon as it can be done, as to what the plan is for the rest of the evening.

By other sources, I have seen the Speaker make a comment that we

would be here into the evening and we might have votes on other matters. There may be motions on a new CR, there may be motions on adjournment at some point.

I would just inform my own Members that I think they need to stay in the House and be ready for whatever happens this evening. I would ask the majority to try to inform the rest of us as soon as something is known.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEPHARDT. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the leader for making this point.

Clearly there are hundreds of thousands of individuals around this country, not just in the Washington metropolitan area, very anxious this evening, very anxious as to what they are supposed to do tomorrow morning, show up for work and are they going to stay at work, are they going to get paid, are they going to have money to pay their mortgage payments, are they going to have money to pay their car payments and their children's tuition in college.

This is a very critical matter. I understand there are differences of agreement, but I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that, in fact, we do get word very quickly as to how we are going to proceed to try to avert the shutdown of the Federal Government and the incurring of very substantial costs tomorrow and the days thereafter by this impasse.

#### APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CONFEREES ON H.R. 2491, SEVEN-YEAR BALANCED BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, under the authority granted in clause 6 of rule X, the Speaker appoints as additional conferees from the Committee on Commerce for consideration of title XVI of the House bill, and subtitle B of title VII of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. BRYANT of Texas and Mr. TOWNS.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will notify the Senate of the change in conferees.

#### PROTECTING HEALTH CARE FOR RETIRED COAL MINERS

(Mr. POSHARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Speaker, over the weekend the so-called Hancock amendment was taken out of the budget reconciliation bill.

This provision would have put at risk the health care coverage of some 100,000 retired coal miners and their families, including several thousand

people who live in the coalfields of Illinois.

I appreciate the action taken by the budget negotiators and encourage them to resist any further efforts to change the 1992 Coal Act or disrupt the balanced approach now in place to care for these miners.

The men and women who have worked years to fuel the economy of this Nation do not need their health care coverage put at risk. I appreciate the bipartisan effort which went into putting this law in place and the bipartisan effort which continues today to keep it in place.

In this vein, let me take just a minute to encourage my colleagues in Congress and in the administration to put the same kind of effort into finding middle ground and solving our budget crisis.

□ 1830

#### NOTIFY FEDERAL EMPLOYEES OF THEIR STATUS

(Mr. MORAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, there are nearly a million people around the country who do not know tonight whether they should come in to work tomorrow who have been deemed non-essential, whatever that means. We owe it to them, if we cannot take appropriate action tonight, to enable them to go to work tomorrow to at least let them know.

It is the height of absurdity to bring 800,000 people to work tomorrow and then to have to tell them because the Congress did not take action the night before, that they have to turn around and go home. We ourselves do not even know whether our own employees should be coming to work tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I would strongly urge the majority, the leadership of this body, to at least let those million Federal employees and the many millions who are dependent upon Federal activities throughout this country to know what the state of affairs is tomorrow, and we, as well, need to have some appropriate policy with regard to our own employees.

It is unfair to have them come in to work tomorrow and then tell them we have decided they are not essential and that they will no longer be paid.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KOLBE). Without prejudice to the resumption of business at a future time this evening, and under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members are recognized for 5 minutes each.

#### OPPOSING THE ELIMINATION OF MILK MARKETING ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ENGLISH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, reconciliation conferees, I would like to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAXON], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH] for their intrusive, decisive, and successful effort to block a provision of the House-passed 7-year Balanced Budget Reconciliation Act that I believe would have unfairly disrupted the livelihoods of our Nation's dairy farmers.

Reconciliation contained a provision entitled "freedom to milk," which legislates the dismantling of the milk marketing orders. This proposal would deregulate the current system by terminating the price support program effective January 21, 1996.

After speaking with dairy farmers from western Pennsylvania, I can assure you that this would be devastating to the industry. According to a recent Mid-Atlantic Dairymen's Inc. analysis of a Food and Agriculture Policy Institute study, net returns to dairy producers would be projected to go down 65 percent in the first year of deregulation and down 43 percent per year on the average for the first 3 years.

Furthermore, under freedom to milk, Pennsylvania dairy farmers are expected to lose over \$150 million. Low farm milk prices and limited availability of credit, coupled with the fact that our GATT partners can still subsidize their dairy farmers, means that the freedom to farm provision is more than scary. For the small dairy farmer in my district, it is fatal.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the present system was not haphazardly scrapped. It has continued to evolve to reflect the needs of the market and consumers. The U.S. dairy industry is one of the most efficient market-oriented dairy industries in the world, and the program which manages this industry costs the Government less than \$70 million each year.

Furthermore, dairy farmers recognize that once again it is time to reform the system, but let us do it constructively.

Why do we not consolidate the orders through the Department of Agriculture's hearing process, simplify the system, and ensure that the small dairy farmer still has input into future reform? Unfortunately, there are still proposals out there to meet the budgetary caps that unfairly tax the dairy farmer, a new 10-cent assessment on top of the existing assessments.

The purpose of agricultural reform and the objective of the reconciliation

process is to reduce taxpayer support of farm programs. A new assessment on dairy producers is nothing more than a direct tax upon every dairy farmer in America.

Mr. Speaker, in my view, the appropriate approach is to realize savings through the price support program currently in place. Such a reduction would realize budgetary savings at no expense under current milk prices for all products to the farmers. At the present time, nonfat dry milk is still being marketed at 6 cents over the support price while butter and cheese are currently 35 percent over support levels.

Accordingly, reduction in the taxpayer-funded price support program would not directly impact farmers, yet would still produce the necessary tax savings.

Mr. Speaker, this summer I had an opportunity to talk to dairymen throughout my district, and they are hurting. They are hurting in a way that they have not been in many, many years. We must, at a time like this, be cautious in how we tamper with price supports for dairy producers because there is a real danger that many of these small and even midsize family farmers will be put out of business by a precipitous policy.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to exchange my special order time with that of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE], and that I be listed later in the day, if that is all right with the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

#### THE BALANCED BUDGET PLAN, MEDICARE AND MEDICAID

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I was very proud today when President Clinton indicated that he would not support, and he would, in fact, veto the continuing resolution because of the increase in the Medicare part B premium.

I think that the public needs to know, and it needs to be reflected more and more amongst ourselves in the House, that essentially this continuing resolution takes away the provision in the current law which, as of January 1, would decrease the amount or the percentage that senior citizens have to pay for their Medicare part B premium, and what the continuing resolution proposes is that the percentage be kept as it is now, which would essentially force an increase in part B premiums as much as, say, \$10 over the next year



per month for those senior citizens. That includes almost all senior citizens who take advantage and pay to have themselves covered under Medicare part B, which pays for physician care.

It is amazing to me, Mr. Speaker, that at a time when we spent almost a month or 2 months or even more trying to deal with the whole budget and come up with the reconciliation and also deal with Medicare, that the Republican leadership continues to insist on increasing Medicare premiums before the time when they ever put together the budget or even have a conference with the budget reconciliation conferees.

I would very much right now like to be at a meeting with the rest of the conferees, with the Democrats and the Republicans, dealing with this budget, dealing with Medicare, dealing with Medicaid. But, so far, all of the meetings have been in secret, just with the Republicans.

I was appointed a conferee for the budget reconciliation a few weeks ago. But we still have not met, because all of the negotiations are taking place on the Republican side without any input or any opportunity for Democrats.

In fact today, in the Washington Post there was an article that said, "Balanced budget plan near complete, Congress may consider massive reconciliation measure on Wednesday." Well, today is Monday. We have not even had a meeting of the reconciliation conferees that was originally called for tonight, but then it was cancelled at the last minute. Now we are told it is tomorrow.

But in the meantime, obviously the Republicans have met in secret and have already decided how they are going to increase the cost to seniors for Medicare, cut their Medicare benefits, and provide tax cuts primarily for wealthy Americans.

There are two very important issues in this budget conference that affect Medicare that I think need to be addressed. In the Senate, unlike the House, nursing home standards were kept intact. In the Senate, unlike the House, the safety net for children, for disabled persons, for pregnant women was kept intact so that there is a guarantee, there continues to be an entitlement in the Senate version of this budget bill that pregnant women, the disabled, and children will get Medicaid and will have health care coverage. But not in the House version.

This is a very important issue, whether or not we are going to continue to have nursing home standards, whether or not we are going to continue to have Medicaid benefits for these disadvantaged groups, and yet there is no meeting of the conferees. Everything is done in secret with the Republican leadership.

Today, there was an article in the New York Times that pointed out that

it is very likely, under the Republican leadership bill, that there will become a shortage of nursing home beds for the elderly in the next few years because with the significant amount of money being reduced for Medicaid, there simply will not be any incentive to even have Medicaid beds in nursing homes.

Similarly, we are told the Medicaid safety net for children could be imperiled with the Republican leadership bill because basically the States will not have the money to provide Medicaid coverage for children.

So I would really like to be a part of this conference where we discuss what is going to happen to the future of our children in terms of their health care coverage, to the future of our nursing homes, whether there will be quality nursing homes, whether there will be enough beds for our citizens in the future.

We do not have that opportunity.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALLONE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KLECZKA. If I understand correctly, you indicated that the massive bill changing Medicare as we know it is currently being worked on by a group of legislators. Then why, in your estimation, would the Republicans want to put the increase in Medicare premiums for our seniors in this continuing bill to keep the Government running past midnight tonight? Why would they pull that section out and put in the simple bill to keep the Government running? What is the rationale there?

□ 1845

Mr. PALLONE. My understanding is they are so determined that this increase take effect on January 1, that they do not want to negotiate it, they do not want to discuss it, they just want to make sure it is included in the continuing resolution so it takes effect with those increases on January 1.

#### QUIT STALLING ON BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FOLEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to read an editorial from the Port St. Lucie News. The editorial says "Quit Stalling on Budget."

[From the Port St. Lucie News, Nov. 13, 1995]

#### QUIT STALLING ON BUDGET

The budget debate now underway is messy and inefficient and may ultimately prove very expensive. It is also irresponsible government and reflects no credit on the White House or the Republican-led Congress.

Enacting an annual budget is Congress' principal job, one in which this Congress is embarrassingly behind schedule with only two of 13 appropriations bills enacted. The fiscal year the lawmakers are arguing over is already more than one month gone and will likely be a fourth over with by the time a package is passed.

Congress dug itself into that hole, largely because of deep and continuing disagreements among Republicans newly in the majority.

That led to the latest obstacle to passing a budget, the provocation of an unnecessary veto fight with Clinton by attempting to use stopgap bills to pass measures—elimination of the Commerce Department, restrictions on lobbying by tax-exempt groups, higher Medicare premiums—that should be dealt with elsewhere in the legislative process.

Despite his belated discovery of presidential veto powers, Clinton has given Congress little sense of where he will stand and fight. He absented himself from the budget process the first eight months of the year and hasn't been much of a participant since.

Clinton may find it personally satisfying—and his campaign advisers politically profitable—to let Congress battle itself bloody over the federal budget. But it is not good government, and it certainly isn't leadership.

Thanks to this impasse, the government may partially shut down Tuesday, an unnecessary bit of budget brinkmanship that wastes time and money, not to mention the damaging impact on the morale of the 800,000 or so government workers whose livelihoods are being treated so cavalierly.

Thanks to this same impasse, the government may bump up against the debt limit late next week and go into technical default. While domestic bond-buyers may not mind, seeing this as a promising sign of fiscal austerity to come, foreign bond-buyers may simply see us as deadbeats and drive up the cost of borrowing for years to come.

To the President and to Senate Majority Leader Robert Dole and House Speaker Newt Gingrich, Americans should say what generations of poker players have said when the pot was tied up with pointless bickering: "Gentlemen, shut up and deal."

Ladies and gentlemen, we need to resolve the issue before the Congress. We would not run a business like this in America, telling our customers that we may or may not be open tomorrow, that we may or may not be there to serve their needs. But at the same time, we have heard bickering from both sides of the aisle, heated rhetoric, about destroying Medicare, about hurting senior citizens.

I have told this story many times. My grandmother came from Poland. She came with a sponsor, a job waiting, a clean bill of health. She worked as a maid in a Travel Lodge motel, all to be part of this democracy. She depended on Medicare and she depended on Social Security. So I am one Member of Congress here to protect that.

But let us make no mistake about it: The balanced budget is necessary to restore fiscal sanity to this Nation. We are borrowing and borrowing and borrowing moneys that we simply do not have. Why are Members of Congress retiring in droves? Why is everybody saying they want out of this job? Because it is no longer fun to go around your community and say "no" to people.

For years you have been able to say I will give you a new Post Office, I will build you a new bridge, I will fix something in your community, I will build a new center for you, all with the taxpayers' nickels, all borrowed dollars.

They went back year after year and said look at me, I am the hero, I have done all of these things for you, you must reelect me.

Now we go to Congress and get elected and say "no" to people and spending money and "yes" to balancing the budget, and people are mad at us. But by God, that is fiscal responsibility. It is happening in our families. It is required of our businesses. A balanced budget is no different than being an American consumer, an American business owner.

But I do think it is wrong we are holding this Government hostage and not meeting at the White House this very hour to solve this problem. I do think it is wrong on both sides of the aisle that we are not seriously debating the issue as we sit here today. I do not think I deserve my paycheck after tomorrow if we are not going to be working. Congress should not get paid either. If the employees of the Federal Government are going to be told they do not need to be here, I think there are maybe 435 nonessential employees right here in this body.

I think it is time we faced the convictions we have. I think it is necessary we balance the budget. I think it is necessary to bring our fiscal house in order. But I think it is also necessary that both sides, Democrats and Republicans, stop the haranguing, stop the finger pointing, stop the name calling, and start debating the very issues that will save our fiscal sanity for the years to come.

I think it is that important. I think it is important for ourselves, for the seniors that live in our communities, for our children, and for America's future.

#### PASS SIMPLE CONTINUING RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, this is a process that we are going through tonight, and unfortunately will be likely going through tomorrow with the shutdown of Federal Government, that should not be happening. In West Virginia there are over 17,000 Federal employees, many of whom will be furloughed. They will not be able to offer the services essential to West Virginia, and their own lives will be placed in uncertainty.

This is a terrible way to do business. The first day or so, people probably will not notice. It is true, Social Security offices will not be handling claims. A day or two you can get by. Over time, you see a steady degradation of Government services and the very important functions that Government employees perform.

In our own offices we have two district offices. The decision by the Re-

publican leadership, as I understand it, essentially says that basically only legislative personnel can be working. We will be furloughing roughly half of the congressional staff. We will leave one person in the Charleston office and one person in the Martinsburg office to handle emergencies, but aside from that, our staff as well will be furloughed. Of course, the mobile offices, the ones that visit the county every day, in a different county every day of the month, they will be furloughed as well. So I think it is a sorry state of affairs that Congress has reached this point.

I think though it is also important to look at what is at stake and why we are here. There are actually two bills at stake, both basically simple. One says that you continue the Government services for about 2 to 3 more weeks. The second one would say that the Federal Government is empowered to continue borrowing to pay back debts.

In both cases the House has passed this bill, but, under the Republican leadership, measures were added that make those bills totally unacceptable. What should have been basically one simple sheet that says "Continue the government," or "You are empowered to continue to borrow money to pay back debts," what could have been one sheet, two or three paragraphs, turned into hundreds of pages of special riders, strings attached, and basically trying to work to enact the Contract With America and the basic budget bill that is so much in controversy.

I think it should also be pointed out, I have heard allegations that somehow the President has not done his job. Let me look at the facts. The reason this has come about is because the budget bill needs negotiating, right? So people ought to be negotiating. The only problem is, there is no budget bill. There is no reconciliation bill. We have yet to get that on the floor of the House.

Incidentally, it is months overdue. By the same token, there are 13 appropriation bills that must pass the Congress and be signed by the President that make up next year's budget. They all are to be done by October 1. Six weeks later this Congress has enacted into law only 2 of the 13 bills. Eleven are out there somewhere, drifting in the nether world of this Capitol. So the President has had very little that he can actually begin negotiating on, because the Congress has not signed it.

Why not just go ahead? And I had this question on a talk show today at home, Mr. Speaker. "Why not go ahead, BOB, and just vote for this continuing resolution? Just vote for the debt ceiling. It is only a couple weeks, and send it on down to the President."

The trouble with that is this: If I voted for that debt ceiling the other day, I would have voted for a \$7 increase in Medicare part B premiums for

every senior citizen in West Virginia, kicking them up from \$46.10 to roughly \$53 on January 1. Merry Christmas, mother and father. What kind of vote is that?

I would have voted for the Republican budget in effect, and put into play already many of the items that still need to be negotiated between the White House and Congress.

I would have been in effect voting for stiff Medicare cuts, one-third of which is needed to save the funds, only \$90 billion, not \$270 billion as is in that budget. I would have voted for Medicaid cuts that would have put West Virginia \$4 billion in the hole over a 7-year period. I would have voted for tax breaks for the wealthy and tax increases for low-income-working people. That is not a good deal. That should not be attached to a basic, simple, continuation of Government services for 2 to 3 weeks.

Now, some have asked, is this not the way things have always been done, you have attached riders? First of all, never with this magnitude. Second, we have a unique situation here. In my time in Congress, I have never seen the day when two major items happen at the same time. You are faced with a shutdown of the Federal Government, that is tough enough, but the second is even more sweeping, you are faced with a default on the national debt, the first time in over 200 years that that happened. Both of those come to happen this week.

So that is why these votes are so significant. My hope is that this Congress stays in tonight, does its job, and passes a simple continuing resolution to keep the Government and a simple extension so that the Government can borrow money to pay back debts and the Government keeps functioning.

#### PLACING THE BLAME FOR A GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, it is going to be a sad situation across the Nation tomorrow—800,000 Federal employees will be sent home. It is a crisis in our Government that is totally unnecessary. It is a political crisis that was created here in this Chamber. You have to really recount the history of how we reached this point to understand how it was totally avoidable.

You see, the Republicans took control of the House of Representatives this year and announced they were going to do things differently. The first announcement they had was they would pass something called the Contract With America, something that Speaker Gingrich had published in TV Guide and believed that since it appeared in TV Guide, he had a mandate



from the American people. So he brought 31 bills to the floor of the House of Representatives. The Speaker, Mr. GINGRICH, and his Republican majority, considered those 31 bills and passed many of them and sent them over to the other body.

The net result of 100 days of deliberation and debate on those 31 bills on the Contract with America was to have signed into law three bills. Three bills, out of 31. So 100 days were wasted at the beginning of the session, and it cost us dearly. The Committee on the Budget, which had a big job already, was delayed in its deliberations because of all the time eaten up by this TV Guide strategy for the Contract With America, this so-called PR extravaganza. So the Committee on the Budget came in with their report exactly 1 month later.

The Committee on the Budget has to do its work and pass its resolution before the appropriations committees that come up with the spending bills can do theirs. So the appropriations committees were slowed down.

The net result was a traffic jam, the end of it on October 1, when the Republican majority in the House and Senate were required to present to the President 13 appropriations bills to keep government running. Six weeks ago, on October 1, they presented three bills. Three out of 13.

You cannot blame the Democrats for that. Republicans are in the majority. The Republicans are in control. One of the big problems they had was that the special interest groups all wanted to put an amendment on each of those appropriations bills. Some of the amendments were virtually outrageous. They had one 28 page amendment that they put on the Veterans Administration and HUD bill. This 28 page amendment abolished 14 environmental protection laws.

The lobby out here, the corridor, was lined with special interest groups and lobbyists in pretty shoes trying to get their amendments on the bills so that they could be somehow absolved from responsibility of clean water and clean air.

Well, they managed to do it the first two times. Finally, the third time, 54 Republicans bolted from Speaker GINGRICH and said "We cannot stand this anymore. We are going to vote with the Democrats." And they took that amendment off. That is just one bill. It is one explanation why only three of the 13 appropriations bills ever made it down to the White House.

So now we come to this situation where the Government cannot continue to run because Speaker GINGRICH and the Republicans could not produce appropriations bills. So we passed something called a continuing resolution, keeping the Government continuing in operation while we figure out how to solve the big questions.

The continuing resolution has been a time-honored tradition around here. We sent them down to the President, they sign them, the Government keeps going on for a few weeks while we resolve our differences. This time Speaker GINGRICH had a little tricky one to put in there, 9 lines out of a 53-page bill. And in those 9 lines, he increased Medicare premiums on senior citizens as of January 1 by 25 percent. The Speaker knew better. The President said he would never sign it. The Democrats opposed it. We do not want senior citizens on Medicare paying 25 percent more in their premiums.

□ 1900

And so the President has said he will veto it. And now we face the prospect that the Federal Government will shut down.

Mr. Speaker, it is a sad situation. It does not reflect well on either party. It does not reflect well on the President or on Congress, but I think the President was right. The President was right in vetoing that bill. There is no reason why we should demand Medicare premiums increases as a price for keeping the Federal Government in operation.

As a matter of fact, the gentleman from New Mexico, Senator DOMENICI, a Republican Senator, today came up with a reasonable compromise, and he is a reasonable man. He said let us freeze that Medicare rate and keep government in operation while we work toward a balanced budget, which we all want to see. That is a reasonable thing. Unfortunately, many of the Republican leaders said to him, sit down and be quiet, we have another strategy.

Their strategy, Mr. Speaker, involves not just shutting down the Federal Government but also, for the first time in the history of the United States of America, we run the potential of defaulting on our national debt. Now, none of us like the fact that America is in debt, but we are all proud of the fact that when we say the full faith and credit of the United States of America it means something. Not just here but around the world. That is our integrity. That is our reputation. That is our credit rating.

The Republicans, because they will not pass a debt extension limit, are jeopardizing that credit rating for the United States of America. That goes far beyond what is necessary. What we need is a bipartisan commonsense approach. Stop the political gamesmanship and do it immediately.

#### AMERICAN PEOPLE OPPOSE EXTREME REPUBLICAN BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, we all know that Speaker GINGRICH holds a

doctorate in history, but over the weekend he may have earned a doctorate in revisionist history as well.

Mr. GINGRICH spend the weekend trying to blame President Clinton for this budget impasse. If we take a quick review of history, however, recent history, it reveals the true culprit is NEWT GINGRICH himself. Since April Speaker GINGRICH has been threatening to shut down the government and throw the country into default. Quite frankly, he is the only person that has talked about shutting the Government down.

But now the day of reckoning has arrived and the Speaker has developed a very serious case of cold feet, so he is desperately trying to blame the President. The fact remains that it is the Speaker who put this blackmail scheme into motion months ago.

Take a look at what Speaker GINGRICH was saying in April. He said the President will veto a number of things and we will then put them all on this debt ceiling that everyone is talking about, and then we will decide how big a crisis that he wants, quoting the Washington Times April 3, 1995.

In September it was reported that Speaker GINGRICH was at it again, continuing his threats. And he says, and I quote, "I don't care what the price is. I don't care if we have no executive offices and no bonds for 30 days, not at this time."

Again the quote, "I don't care what the price is." That says it all, does it not?

Well, Speaker GINGRICH may not care what the price is because he is not the one who is going to be asked to pay. The price of a government shutdown and government default will fall squarely on the shoulders of middle class families in this Nation. When the Speaker gets his wish and the government shuts down, the Speaker will keep his job, he will keep his pay, but over 800,000 Federal workers will not.

When the government defaults on its financial obligations, again the Speaker will have his book royalties to cushion that blow, but millions of middle class families will pay the price in higher mortgage payments, in higher car payments, and in higher credit card payments. The blame for this manufactured crisis should fall squarely on the shoulders of NEWT GINGRICH and not on the shoulders of middle class families in this country.

Mr. Speaker, the President is right to say no to a budget that calls for higher Medicare payments for seniors. As a matter of fact, on January 1, it will be a 25 percent increase for this Nation's seniors, higher college tuitions for students and their parents, and higher taxes for working middle-class families. This is not an agenda that the American people support; and, in fact, it appears the public never did support this kind of agenda.

Mr. Speaker, for months Republicans have been promoting their Contract

With America by saying that more than 60 percent of the American public supported its policies. However, we find out from last Friday that they had a political consultant whose name is Frank Luntz, and he claimed he tested all of these policies. In fact, what he did, and he was forced to admit this last week, that he actually only polled and talked to the American public about slogans. About 10 slogans.

So it turns out that the Gingrich revolution is built on the 10 most popular slogans that the Republicans could find. It had nothing to do with programs. There was no testing of how Americans would feel about cutting \$270 billion from Medicare, of increasing the payments for senior citizens and cutting student loans. It is no wonder that the bumper sticker government of the new majority has worn thin with the American public.

All the sloganeering will not hide the devastating cuts to seniors, to students and to middle class families in this country. And, in fact, what is happening today is the more that the American public understands the nature of this program, the more they did like the Gingrich revolution. As a matter of fact, on Friday, in USA Today, public opposition to the Contract With America was affirmed. Sixty percent of those polled want President Clinton to veto the Republican budget as it stands. More specifically, 75 percent oppose the GOP's Medicare cuts and 74 percent oppose the GOP's student loan cuts.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say that the Republicans have lost public support for these policies, so now what they have done is resorted to blackmailing the President to get him to sign this extreme budget. That is what this is all about. But I will tell my colleagues that the President is standing with the American people in opposition to these policies.

To my Republican colleagues I say, if they want the President to sign their budget, make changes, do not make threats. If they want him to sign the budget, lessen the blow to senior citizens, to our children and to middle class families. The President wants to work with the Republicans, Democrats in this House want to work with them, but we will not be blackmailed into accepting a budget that the American people oppose.

Instead of rewriting history, please, I say to my Republican colleagues, rewrite your budget, do not hold a gun to the President's head, particularly do not hold a gun and do not hold the American people hostage in this next 24 hours.

#### CONGRESS HAS FAILED IN ITS BUDGETARY MANDATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

woman from Florida [Ms. BROWN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, joining me for my 5 minutes is the gentlewoman from Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON.

Mr. Speaker, I received a telephone call Thursday from one of my constituents, one of my veterans, a disabled veteran, and he was very concerned as to whether or not his benefits would be cut or whether or not he would receive them on time.

I am very upset that the Republican leadership in this House is upsetting my constituents. Can we discuss how we got to this point with this 104th Congress?

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let me say to the gentlewoman from Florida that this is a plan that has been of long standing and of long coming. If we check back through the papers, on April 3, in the Washington Times, Mr. GINGRICH boasted that the President will veto a number of things and then we will put them all on the debt ceiling, and then he will decide how big a crisis he wants.

Now, that is April 3, back when he stated that the strategy was to create a titanic legislative standoff with President Clinton by adding vetoed bills to a must-pass legislation, increasing the national debt ceiling.

I am not sure that that is anything that just started today or the last 24 or 48 hours. That has been the plan for a long time.

Then June 5, in Time magazine, Mr. GINGRICH was quoted as saying, "He can run the parts of the government," speaking of the President, "that are left after the Republican budget cuts or he can run no government. Which of the two of us do you think worries more about government not showing up?"

Now, that is the message that Mr. GINGRICH was sending to a number of senior citizens and to a number of children and working families, and that was in Time magazine June 5.

Then, in the Washington Post on September 22, the stated, "I do not care what the price is, I do not care if we have no Executive offices and no bonds for 30 days. Not this time."

I do not think that is responsible, but I am quoting that directly from these publications.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentlewoman from Texas that in August I conducted a series of town meetings, and in one of my meetings we had a joint discussion with another Member from Florida, and he indicated in the August meeting that they were prepared to shut this Government down if the President did not go along with their extreme agenda.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Well, I do think it is extreme

when we decide that our senior citizens must pay, even against the American people's will, much more now for their premiums when it really is not necessary except to give that tax break that has been promised for the most wealthy people of the Nation.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. If we look at our history, the Congress has one duty, my understanding, and that is to pass the appropriation bills. Does the gentlewoman know when those bills are due?

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Well, of course the bills are due by midnight September 30, because the new fiscal year starts October 1. Clearly, that has not been done. Yet, the votes are here in this body for the Speaker to get his will, but they have not passed.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Does the gentlewoman recall that we had that hundred days and all that charade? And how many bills have we passed in the 104th as compared to our class, the 103d?

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I do not know, but I can tell my colleague there has been a lot of them. And we have had a lot more votes. We have worked a whole lot more hours and a lot longer days than we worked the session before, but we were completed with our business on time.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I think that this Congress has passed two appropriation bills, and my understanding is that we have to pass 13. In fact, if we had done our work then, we would not be in this crisis mode tonight.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I think what the American people are reacting to is the extremism, the extremes which these bills contain, and that is why we are having such difficulty bringing them to finality. When we decide that our children need no protection in the water or in the food or the air, and our seniors or working families or any of the American people, that is extreme.

#### THE EFFECTS OF THE CONTRACT WITH AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to dialogue 5 minutes with my colleague. Would my colleague continue her remarks?

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Yes, I am very concerned as to this contract. The Republicans talked about the Contract With America. I have often said it was a contract on America. A contract on the elderly people, a contract on the children, a contract on the poor people.

□ 1915

This reverse Robin Hood, robbing from the working people and the poor people to give to the rich.



Now, Mr. Speaker, they have offered up provisions in this Contract With America that they could not pass in the Senate. I have always been so very proud of being a Member of the House. I served 10 years in the Florida House and 2 years here, and I have always been proud of the fact that the House deliberates, we have hearings.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I can thank God for the other body who just do not take up this work, this sometimes trashy work this House has produced, and pass it on.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I served in both the Texas House and the Texas Senate, and I have never been in a position where I could say that I did everything the way I wanted it to be done, but what I can say is that everyone had an opportunity to be heard, to call witnesses, and then there was a fair vote.

Very, very frequently, I got a part of what I wanted, others got parts of what they wanted. But in the end, it was a piece that was made up of input and one that we could say that a clear majority wanted. It was called compromising, negotiating, agreeing, and then a majority win.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that that will work in any deliberative body, but without that, it cannot. Here I am not even sure we are listening, because poll after poll, and then finally last week's local elections, have demonstrated the growing level of opposition to the Medicare and Medicaid cuts and the education cuts, which are not popular, but no one is listening.

This budget is being held hostage in order to impose higher Medicare premiums on seniors. This is not what the public wants. This is a body of, by, and for the people. This is a democracy, but nobody is listening; at least the ones who are trying to ram their ideas through are really not listening.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that the Republicans really are interested in negotiating, despite these weak complaints about the Democrats. The Republican leadership has demonstrated no sincere interest in negotiating. If there was interest in negotiating, we would use the proper procedures. We would simply not load up these simple resolutions with all of the legislation for the entire session to be in them.

It is not fair. It is not right. It is not according to anyone's procedure. It is heavy-handed. It is insulting, and it is ignoring the wishes of the American people.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. One thing I have learned from the Republicans is: He who has the gold makes the rules. It is like if you invite someone over to your house to play cards and you change the rules each step of the way, that is what we are experiencing here. The Republicans change the rules to fit whatever they are trying to do at that moment.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Clearly, this has been a long-time strategy; one that I really could not believe that we would have persons in the kind of responsible positions as we have planning this shutdown longer than 6 months ago, planning to ramrod unpopular ideas and policies that will hurt the majority of the American people in simple resolutions, simply because we have not completed our work.

If these are policies that ought to stand, they ought to stand without being loaded into these simple resolutions. We should be able to work those out. We should be able to allow the resolutions to go forward clean, and then come to the negotiating table.

This is simply a technique, in my opinion, to pull the President into a fight, where he has clearly stated that using the proper procedure for negotiating is acceptable, but he will not be hoodwinked into attempting to negotiating by allowing these higher premiums to go in and all these protections to be removed from our air, food, and water.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Do we have a final word for our constituents as to what is going on in Washington and what they should do? I suggest that they call their Congresspeople and let them know how they feel about how they are wasting taxpayers' dollars by furloughing people, by shutting down the Government.

#### CONGRESS SHOULD COME TOGETHER AND SERVE AMERICA WELL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARR). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, in a time of crisis, one wonders where is that forceful leadership of the majority? Where is the forceful leadership of the Speaker? I tell my colleagues where they are. They are playing a dangerous game of chicken. Mr. Speaker, I say to them, shame on you for doing that.

In particular, in a state of crisis and emergency, Medicare and Medicaid should not be played as pawns and toys in the hands of people who want to force their way. I say they need to find new toys and new games to play and not force these kinds of unacceptable views on the President.

When we get down to the brass tacks, it makes no difference who flinches first. That will be lost in yesterday's news. The people will forget all of that. What they will wonder is that we failed to govern, we failed to take care of the people's business.

By the time the majority comes to their senses, their capricious acts will have already hurt those people who can least afford to sustain these harsh

blows: The elderly, the poor, the disabled; not only those who are being furloughed tomorrow or at midnight tonight.

The majority has voted to cut Medicare by \$270 billion. To do what? To make sure their wealthy friends get a tax break. The poorest of the poor, those who receive Medicaid, \$182 billion will be reduced. That will mean unnecessary pain for a lot of people who now already find themselves in distress.

Mr. Speaker, what does this mean for my district in North Carolina? It means North Carolina will lose \$6.75 billion in Medicare funding for the next 5 years. And add to that Medicaid, which again will lose \$6.76 billion. Those combined would be \$13.51 billion that we will lose in the State of North Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, that will affect millions of people, and yet my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to overload this resolution to continue to make the Government function by making sure we increase the premiums for senior citizens and Medicare. That is uncalled for. That is uncalled for.

Again, Mr. Speaker, what other things in the budget reconciliation do we find objectionable? Mr. Speaker, \$16.5 billion will be cut from the farming community as well. That will hurt people in my district.

Why is it that the President finds these objectionable? Because he wants to serve the majority: American people, whether they are farmers or senior citizens, or whether they are the poor. Medicaid itself in my district will affect some 882,000 people. Medicare affects some 999,000 people in my district. Should I not be concerned about that? Of course we are concerned about that. That is what we find objectionable about the budget reconciliation.

When we ask for a continuation of Government for 1 month, my Republican colleagues want to overload it with things we already find that are unacceptable in the budget reconciliation. Who will be helped and who will be hurt, I ask? Only those who receive the tax break will be helped.

Certainly, the Federal employees who are going to be furloughed tomorrow will not be helped, and certainly those who will see an increase in their Medicare premiums in January will not be helped. Certainly, the students who are going to lose their loans and find that the interest payment is going to be increased are not going to be helped.

Mr. Speaker, what is this all about? Should this not be about bringing Americans together? I say, shame on you, shame on you, Speaker of this House. Shame on you, the leader of this House. Shame on you, the majority in this House who do not find it in their vested interest to govern and to govern well.

Mr. Speaker, we need to come together, Republicans and Democrats

both, to understand this is a time of crisis. We need leadership. We need to stop this chicken game of who will flinch first. The American people are annoyed at that arrogance. We need grownups to act like grownups and not act like overspoiled children. I beesech to my colleagues to come together as persons of responsibility, persons of compassion, and to serve America well.

#### "LET THEM EAT DOG FOOD"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, about now in the First Congressional District in Denver, CO, Federal workers, thousands of them, are going home after a long day's work and they are wondering if they come back tomorrow. What do they do? Does anybody recognize how hard their work is? What is going on?

Mr. Speaker, 45 days after the fiscal year ran out, they cannot believe this body cannot have a budget together. They also cannot believe we could not even get anything of substance on the President's desk, really; that the fight is with the other body. We cannot even get it down Pennsylvania Ave. So, they are driving home in their cars wondering what kind of career mistake they ever made to go into public service and dedicate their lives to this.

Mr. Speaker, people who live in the First Congressional District are hearing now that this shutdown is going to cost the economy \$10 million to \$15 million a day. It is going to cost taxpayers, and that is outrageous.

Mr. Speaker, people going home in their cars who have been designated "essential," so they can go back tomorrow, and they are realizing how inefficient it is going to be without support staff. People are going to phone in and not get an answer, and they are going to phone in to this body and not get an answer.

What is all of this about? Last night we got a little window into this, because the GOPAC people had a gala. They had a gala. GOPAC is the group that the Speaker put together that brought all the new Members of Congress is here on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, they had address this great gala the person who they have designated as an honorary member of their class, Rush Limbaugh. Rush Limbaugh stood up to talk about what a great night it was. He said he greeted his fellow extremists and he hailed the new Republican budget, because he said it would starve the poor and it would take those on Medicare, like his mother, he said, and force them on dog food. But, he said, his mother was probably watching C-SPAN and he wanted her to

know he was sending her a new can opener.

We have all heard of Marie Antoinette who said, "Let them eat cake." Apparently the new cry of this group is, "Let them eat dog food." Take a sock for Christmas and take cans of dog food and insert them for people who are on Medicare, because if the President is to be able to stop this tonight, he has got to agree to \$13 more in premiums for the people on Medicare. That is why Rush Limbaugh is so happy that his mother is going to be on dog food.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not. My mother is not going to eat dog food, and I do not think we ought to have Federal employees going to dog food. I think for the great Nation that this Nation is, that kind of talk is absolutely outrageous.

Mr. Speaker, if we condemn, and we have as a nation, the Marie Antoinettes who were so out of touch, who said, "Let them eat cake," we ought to be condemning just as insensitive a statement as, "Let them eat dog food."

Mr. Speaker, we should not be attaching mandatory increases to Medicare to keeping the Government going. None of it makes any sense. This is about a dysfunctional part of the Government right now, the legislative branch.

Mr. Speaker, we ought to come in here, reconvene, and we ought to pass a clean continuing resolution so Government goes on. We ought to increase the debt ceiling, so Government goes on and the full faith and credit of this country is not run to the cliff. And then we ought to go back and work out that budget that was due 45 days ago. Mr. Speaker, 85 percent of it has not been finalized. Work that out. Bring it here in the regular process.

No wonder the American people are disgusted. The haughtiness and the arrogance of laughing about one's mother and laughing about how the poor are going to suffer and, "Isn't that a great day?"

□ 1930

If you really think the problem of America is that the real needy are the greedy and that the real greedy are needy, are not greedy, they are too greedy, then you are going to love what is going on. But I think most Americans do not think that the greedy are real needy.

If you have got hundreds of dollars to go to these great galas and fundraisers, you are not exactly suffering. And you may think it is funny for those who are suffering but I do not. I think it is tragic for Federal employees who have families, who have mortgages, who have school tuition. I hope Members of this body try and write notes to all of them, see if they can get some kind of an extension on their mortgage. See

what they can do. They cannot. We should not do this. We should convene. We should have a clean continuing resolution. We should have a clean debt resolution. We should get on with business as usual and let us knock off this talk about dog food.

I am not from the heritage of Marie Antoinette. I am from the heritage of the great leaders of this country who believed every American counted and you did not make fun of them, of their social status or their economic status. Let us move forward in that tradition.

#### MEDICARE AND STUDENT LOANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, for months Speaker GINGRICH promised to shut the Government down so he could score political points. The Washington Times earlier this year said, "House Speaker NEWT GINGRICH vowed yesterday to create a titanic legislative standoff with President Clinton by adding vetoed bills to must-pass legislation increasing the national debt ceiling."

The Washington Times, in April of 1995, said the President will veto a number of things and will then put them all in the debt ceiling and then he will decide how big a crises he wants.

Five months later leading up to this budget problem we are in now and this close-down-the-government threat, Speaker GINGRICH said, "I don't care what the price is. I don't care if we have no executive offices and no bonds for 30 days, not at this time."

An Ohio Congressman, Ohio Republican Congressman said, If we close down, people will listen. An Ohio Congressman also said, I do not see the Government shutdown as a negative; I see it as a positive, if things get righted. A Nebraska Republican Congressman said, If we have to temporarily shut down the Government to get people's attention, then so be it. The question, Mr. Speaker, is, why are they doing this? What is the point of this? The answer is, the Gingrich plan cuts \$270 billion from Medicare and billions of dollars more from student loans in order to pay for a tax break for the wealthiest people in this country. Say it again, the Gingrich plan cuts \$270 billion in Medicare and billions more in student loans aimed at middle-class families in order to give a tax break for the wealthiest people in this country.

Mr. Speaker, no Congress in our history, in the history of this country, has ever demanded an increase in Medicare premiums as a condition of keeping the Government open. What I do not understand is the feelings that some Members in this body have, notably the Speaker, toward Medicare.



Medicare, Mr. Speaker, has been in effect for 30 years and a few months. It was created in 1965 when Lyndon Johnson signed the Medicare Act in July of that year. At that time 50 percent of America's elderly had no health insurance. Today between 1 and 2 percent of America's elderly have no health insurance. This is a successful program. It is expensive, but it has helped people live better and helped people live longer. It is a Government program that works. It is probably, very possibly, probably the Government program that has done the best things for the people of this country, perhaps of any program in the history of this country.

Yet Speaker GINGRICH said, speaking to a bunch of insurance executives who will benefit monetarily in a big, big way from the Gingrich Medicare plan, he said, "Now, we don't want to get rid of Medicare in round one because we don't think that is politically smart. We don't think that is the right way to go through our revolutionary transition. But we believe that Medicare is going to wither on the vine."

This is a man that took the oath of office to the people of this country. Yet all of us, I think, have an obligation to the people of this country to make sure that we honor the trust, the agreement between the American people and this Government that Medicare be there and work for people.

Medicare works. It is a program that works. It has insured a huge number of elderly people in this country and made a difference in keeping their lives healthier and helping them live longer.

The other attack from this Government, from the Gingrich budget and the Gingrich plan, is an attack on student loans and middle-class families. How can we look to the future when we are cutting, taking away the ability, reducing the ability of middle-class families in this country to send their kids to college. Whether it is Ohio State, whether it is a private school, whether it is Lorain County Community College, students have needed those student loans, they have two parents working oftentimes. Often the student himself or herself is working but they need those student loans in order to go to college, in order to get the kind of degree to compete with people around the world.

Employers around Lorain County in my district, in and around Toledo and my friend from Lucas County's district and around Ohio and around this country, employers tell us over and over that they have got \$8- and \$12- and \$15-an-hour jobs out there and sometimes they cannot find people qualified to fill them. We have got to continue to put, to move forward in global competition. We have got to ensure that students get loans. This Gingrich budget goes right at the heart of middle-class America in cutting and reducing and eliminating student loan programs. It

simply does not make sense, Mr. Speaker.

I ask again this House for a clean continuing resolution, a clean debt ceiling resolution. It is absolutely senseless to hold up the Government in order to cut Medicare and in order to cut student loans. Let us move forward on these clean resolutions. Let us debate Medicare. Let us debate student loans and see what the country thinks and make those decisions separately and move forward the way we were elected to do.

#### NAFTA ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and wish to state that I think this is a sad night for America, for our country and this Congress, as we are held hostage by a few extremists who want to take actions like raising premiums on Medicare part B for our senior citizens and rolling back environmental standards across this country, under the guise of a bill that is supposed to be about running our country and conducting the people's business.

One of the reasons that the Government is short on funds and our families are working harder and showing less for it in their pocketbooks and their wallets is because of the dry rot inside the economy of the United States. It is that that I want to focus on, and it is that subject I wish that we as a Congress would be focusing on.

This week represents the second anniversary of NAFTA's passage on November 17, 1993. Each day this week, several of my colleagues and I will be here on this floor discussing various aspects of that agreement. We will be calling attention to its performance to date which can be properly characterized as truly dismal and devastating for thousands of Americans as well as Mexican workers and their families. But it has been truly rewarding for speculators on Wall Street and Mexico's Wall Street at the Bolsa in Mexico City.

Promises, promises, we were given lots of promises. During the NAFTA debate we were promised it would create 200,000 jobs just this year; good jobs, they told us, jobs that could help people pay taxes, jobs that could help people increase their incomes. However, as the Wall Street Journal recently reported, the reality is, and I quote: "There has been no evidence of any overall gain in jobs as a result of this agreement with Mexico."

In fact, by the end of this year, 800,000 people in our country and several million in Mexico will have had their jobs put on the chopping block because of this agreement.

Think about the toll of human lives in our country just in the last 2 weeks. Fruit of the Loom announced 3,200 jobs being shut down in this country in Kentucky, Alabama, Mississippi, the Carolinas, moving to Mexico. And 479 workers out of work in St. Joseph, Missouri. They made Lee jeans. They earned \$8.35 an hour. And chocolate workers in Hershey, Pennsylvania who were told that they are going to be laid off, get their pink slips because Hershey has decided to move its production of Giant Kisses to Guadalajara, Mexico. So I guess we could say NAFTA has become a giant kiss of death for many workers in our country.

I want to pause here for a moment and say that NAFTA did not really grow out of a vacuum. It is merely one agreement within the larger context of our Nation's extremely flawed and ill-advised trade agreements which purposely ignore consequences on large segments of our people. These policies and trade agreements have spawned and destroyed both jobs and wealth in our country by providing incentives to export our jobs someplace else, exporting income from our people, increasing frustration in our electorate and causing a kind of doubt about the ability of this Government to deliver.

There is economic dry rot out there in our country. Think about the last 20 years. The average American family has not had an increase in their purchasing power. In fact, the high school graduate today makes 27 percent less in real wages on what they can actually buy with their check than their counterparts did 20 years ago, but the chief executive officers of our country are earning just in the last year 12 percent more real wages than they did in the prior year.

Now, what exactly are those CEO's being rewarded for? Fortune 500 companies have not created a single job in this country for a decade. Virtually all their investment in production has been abroad. American workers are being asked to compete against capital that can move anywhere in the world, foreign cartels that block our access into their markets and millions of low-wage workers in the world who live under undemocratic regimes.

The resultant pull-down in wages in our country has been verified by economists like the University of California's Professor George Borjas, who maintains at least 25 percent of the loss in wages in this country is due to the type of trade agreement that we got ourselves locked into including the NAFTA agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that this week we will be introducing the NAFTA Accountability Act. My colleagues and I will be on the floor talking about its various provisions. We are going to listen to what the public is telling us. Once we restore the economic health of the country it will

be easier to restore the governance of the Nation.

#### NAFTA DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ANDREWS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, it appears certain that tomorrow a substantial portion of the Federal Government will shut down. That is a very serious and very negative and very real thing for hundreds of thousands of people who work for the Federal Government in this country. I regret that.

I would urge my colleagues to work together tonight and for the rest of this week as long as it takes to prevent that. There is no good reason why these good people have to be put at risk tomorrow.

I want to come back to something that my friend from Ohio just talked about a few minutes ago. That is there have been lots of other shutdowns in America in the last few years as well that have nothing to do, directly at least, with the Federal payroll but have a lot to do with the shutdown of economic growth and opportunity. Yes; it is true and it is regrettable that hundreds of thousands of Federal employees will not go to work and will not get paid tomorrow and will not be able to pay their bills.

A lot of other Americans will not go to work tomorrow, too; the ones who worked in manufacturing jobs and made \$10 or \$12 or \$15 an hour and saw their job go to Mexico or Malaysia. A lot of other Americans will go to work tomorrow in jobs that pay them 40 or 50 percent of what they need to make to meet their family budget. The man or the woman who was working in mid-management at a bank and making \$40,000 or \$45,000 a year a few years ago who now is making \$20,000 or \$25,000 a year.

A lot of young Americans will go to work tomorrow at the shopping mall at their part-time job, even though they have a master's degree or a college degree in a field that ought to get them a job at a much higher rate of wages. A lot of senior citizens tomorrow are going to wake up and wonder if they are going to be able to turn their heater above 65 degrees because they are so worried they cannot pay their utility bill.

The rest of America, Mr. Speaker, sort of shut down a while ago. A lot of American families have seen their budgets shut down and be ratcheted down. So maybe it is time that we had this confrontation here to talk about our Federal budget and its impact on the family budget.

□ 1945

I agree, as a Democrat, with my friends, Mr. Speaker, across the aisle

who say that we ought to balance the budget and do it in 7 years, and I agree with them that it ought to be done without increasing the tax burden on the American people. They are already overtaxed as far as I am concerned. I do not agree with the exact way that our Republican friends have chosen to do this.

I think that we should be getting rid of accounts that pay for overseas advertising by food companies, not getting rid of remedial reading teachers in the public schools. I think that we can go to some of our agribusinesses in this country that receive welfare checks not to grow food and cut them off instead of raising the cost of going to college for middle-class families. I think that a lot of the tax loopholes and giveaways in the Internal Revenue Code to insurance companies, and banks, and Fortune 500 companies could go by the wayside so we would not have to be raising Medicare premiums on the elderly in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I think we can do it differently, but I agree we have to do it. We have to balance the budget, and we ought to do it in 7 years, and we ought to get to work instead of standing around here tonight just talking to each other about it.

But we ought to do some other things as well. We ought to fix and change our educational system in this country so having a high school diploma means something again, so people are able to graduate from high school and get a job in a noncollege situation, so that people who choose to be a bricklayer, or computer technician, or a cosmetologist, or an electronics worker, can go to school, get a high quality education, get into the job market. We ought to fix our trade policy so that Americans can compete and sell our products in other countries as well as other countries can sell their products here. We should get rid of some of the foolish and pointless regulations that we have imposed on our businesses that do not clean the water, or protect our workplaces, or clean the air, but simply raise the cost of doing business.

Mr. Speaker, it is essential, but not sufficient, to balance the budget in 7 years, but by all means, Mr. Speaker, it is essential for us to get to work, and I hope that what we do in the next couple of days is put aside the posturing over the 1996 election and get to the serious business of worrying about the real problems of real Americans out there tonight, Mr. Speaker, who are afraid they cannot pay their bills, who are watching their incomes shrink, and their taxes rise, and their children's hopes evaporate.

America is in a real and deep economic crisis. For us to fiddle as family finances burn, for us to talk about who is going to get elected in 1996 rather than who is going to be able to pay their bills in the next 6 days or 6

months is really a disservice to this country.

Let us get to work, Mr. Speaker, and do the job the people sent us here to do.

#### HOW TO BALANCE THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARR of Georgia). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk just briefly about where we are tonight at 10 minutes of 8 o'clock to my constituents back in Indiana, roughly 4 hours and 10 minutes before the Government might shut down, which is a very, very serious consideration and a serious subject for people throughout this country.

I think, Mr. Speaker, quite frankly that it should not have come to this. It should not come to a situation where we are messing around with the credit rating and the ability of the Secretary of the Treasury, and the U.S. Government, and the President, and Members of the Republican Party and the Democratic Party, to negatively affect our ability to pay on our debt. I think the American people at this time, 4 hours from now, talking about the Government shutting down, are saying to one another they do not want us to act like Republicans and Democrats, and pointing our fingers, talking about gridlock, and partisan games, and even deadlock as we reach this midnight bewitching hour, but what are we doing for the best interests of America? What kinds of considerations are we making for the hard-working people of this country that want to balance the budget, that do not want to see their taxes go up, but want a fair outcome when we balance the budget, that want to make sure that the budget is not balanced on the backs of senior citizens that barely make it month to month on their Medicare or their Social Security, senior citizens that I listen to and work with in my district all the time who tell me, not only do they barely make it by the dime or the quarter, but these senior citizens are the people that, when they get a gift, somebody gives them a present, a birthday present, an anniversary present, they usually keep that wrapping paper and reuse it, or, if they are going to buy something from the supermarket, oftentimes the seniors in northern Indiana will go to three and four different places to find the best bargain, sometimes eating up, maybe, in gas money what they may have saved looking for the best bargain because they know month to month they are barely going to make it.

Mr. Speaker, we should not be cutting Medicare by \$270 billion. We should also not be cutting student loans by \$10 billion. One of the most important things to the constituents



that I represent here in Washington, DC, when I come here to work from Indiana, is that we give them and their children the opportunity to get to college. Some of my people that have been working for 10, and 15, and 20 years find because the economy is changing they have to go back to school and learn some new skills, some computer skills, some blueprint skills, some total quality management skills, and they are going to schools in Indiana to learn these new skills. We should not make it more difficult, we should not make it more expensive we should not make it more arduous for these people to get this education and training, to help our economy move forward.

But where do we cut, Mr. Speaker, because we do need to balance this budget in 7 years? I think that is where the Republican colleagues of mine have it right. We do need to make tough decisions with a fair outcome to get this balanced budget on line in 1995.

I think we start with B-2 bombers that the Pentagon does not even want, that the CINC commanders, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, have said we do not need these. I think we talk about tobacco subsidies where we cost taxpayers money twice, once by paying their tobacco subsidy through the Government, another time by paying hospital costs for patients that go to the hospital and contract cancer. I think we cut in a host of areas, through eliminating the Interstate Commerce Commission, to eliminate or at least reforming and changing, the market subsidies we give to big corporations to advertise overseas. These are corporate welfare proposals and programs that we do not need in 1995 if we are going to balance the budget.

Mr. Speaker, over 300 Members of Congress have voted for a balanced budget; 73 voted for a coalition budget; over 230 Republicans voted for a balanced budget proposal some weeks ago. Now I think we should begin to move forward in bringing a number of these people together, hopefully 218, that will come up with a fair way to our seniors, and our students and our working people in this country to get that balanced budget in effect.

#### THE PRESIDENTIAL POLITICS OF BALANCING THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to talk a little bit about our balanced budget proposal, our 7-year balanced budget proposal, and in particular the President and his previous claims of supporting a balanced budget, and I do want to dwell a little bit on the issue of Medicare. I think Medicare is a very important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I am very familiar with the Medicare system. I earned my living prior to coming to the House of Representatives, and I plan on when I leave the House of Representatives going back to, practicing medicine. I am a physician, and I very much enjoyed taking care of senior citizens as an internist. About half of my clinical practice was caring for seniors, and I know firsthand how much our seniors depend on the Medicare program, and I think what the President is doing with this issue is truly disgraceful, and he is playing pure politics with the Medicare program, and in his proposal he wants to lower the Medicare premium to 25 percent, and then in subsequent years, after the election, essentially after he has bought the senior vote, he is going to let it drift up. In our proposal the Medicare part B premium will do exactly what it has done over the previous 7 years under the Democrats of this House. It will slowly double. Under the President's proposal it will double as well, but it goes down in the crucial year of 1996 when he is seeking to get reelected.

What are we talking about in our budget proposal? We are talking about a 7-year balanced budget proposal. We have not been able to get the President to agree to this very fundamental principle. This is a man who ran in 1992 pledging that he would balance the budget in 5 years. Three years after he has been elected, he is refusing to sign on to a 7-year balanced budget proposal. Instead he is putting forward this budget proposal that supposedly gets us to balance in 10 years, 13 years after he has been elected when he ran on a 5-year proposal. We have welfare reform in our budget proposal. He refuses to support that, a man who ran saying that he was going to end welfare as we know it.

What else do we have in our budget proposal? Tax relief for families with children. When my father was raising myself and my three sisters, as a postal worker he sent 4 percent of his income to Washington. Now those working fathers with children send 25 to 30 percent of their income to Washington. That is the single biggest reason why so many of those working families with children have to put mama out to work, too, and my colleagues know what happens then. They do not spend as much time with their kids. In the 1950's the average parents spent 35 hours a week in direct contact with their children. They now spend 17 hours a week. Who is taking care of the kids? The television loaded with violence.

Finally, what else do we have in our budget proposal? We have economic incentives, a capital gains reduction that will pump money back into the economy, that will create jobs, jobs for people who are unemployed, and the President is refusing to sign on to any of

these things, and what is the most crass thing, he is actually going so far as to try to claim he is trying to protect Medicare when in reality it is a temporary thing in Medicare. A year later the Medicare premiums will rise, and rise, and rise, and rise, and the President knows all this. But yet he is continuing to play politics. When the Medicare program was created, the Medicare part B premium was supposed to be shared by seniors, 50 percent coming out of the pockets of working people, 50 percent coming out of the pockets of seniors. Today many of those working people who are being taxed to support the Medicare Program cannot afford health insurance themselves. In our budget proposal we keep the percentage at 31½ percent. That is what it is at today. We think that is a fair and reasonable thing to do.

But yet the President is trying to play politics with this. He is trying to lower the Medicare premium in an election year, and then he is going to turn around and raise it on seniors just like he turned around and raised taxes in 1993 after he ran in 1992 saying that he was going to give middle-class working Americans a tax cut. He raised taxes on them; he raised taxes on senior citizens. Senior citizens had their Social Security income taxed, an increase in their taxes.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all my colleagues in the House, as well as my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, to put politics aside and join together in a reasonable proposal to get us toward a balanced budget in 7 years.

□ 2000

It is for our future, it is for the future of our children, it is for the future of our children's children. What kind of life are we going to leave the next generation? In years past, you paid off the farm, you did not leave the kids a mortgage. Today in America, today in America, every child that is born is being born into an economy where they owe \$18,000 of debt. They are going to have to pay back with interest on that debt about \$18,000. That is \$4.9 trillion worth of debt. Mr. Speaker, I encourage the President to support our budget, to vote in favor of balancing the budget in 7 years.

#### NOW IS THE TIME TO BALANCE THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARR). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I agree with just about everything my colleague the gentleman from Florida, who preceded me, has just said. I have been in Congress now for 13 years, and I have gone out and had a lot of town meetings with senior citizens and

people from all across my district. I have talked all across the country. When you talk to people about the pain of cutting spending, people say, "We have to balance that budget. We do not want to leave a legacy of debt to our kids and to our grandkids. We do not want to see hyperinflation in this country."

After you get through talking, we start going around the room and we let them ask questions. Inevitably, somebody will say, "You are not going to cut this program, are you?" Somebody will say, "You are not going to cut this program, are you?" Before you know it, everybody in the room has some program that the Federal Government funds, or partially funds, that they are all interested in; maybe highways, maybe Medicare, maybe Social Security, maybe welfare. It may be a number of things, but everybody wants the budget balanced and they want their kids to be secure and their future to be secure, but they do not want their programs to be cut.

We have had 40 years of movement toward socialism, toward complete government control over our lives. Make no mistake about it, we are at a point now where if we do not make some real hard decisions, we are going to get what we do not want as a Nation. If you look around the world, and I am on the Committee on International Relations, I can tell you a lot of countries that have hyperinflation have disintegration of government and government services because they have gone too far. We are heading in that direction. We have to make some choices.

The people in this country last year elected a Republican majority in the House and Senate because they wanted change. They wanted a balanced budget. Eighty-eight percent of the people in this country want a balanced budget. If I were talking to America tonight, Mr. Speaker, I would say, "Look, there is no easy way out. We are going to have to bite the bullet. Everybody is going to have to have a little bit of the share of pain."

We are not cutting these programs. We are slowing the growth of the programs. Medicare is not going to be cut. The growth in Medicare is going to be 6.5 percent over the next 7 years. It is going to grow. But we are not going to allow it to grow at 10 to 15 percent, like it grew before. We are going to give money for the school lunch program. It is going to grow, but we are going to send the money back to the States so the Governors can more efficiently spend the money, rather than have some bureaucracy here in Washington spend it.

We have to do something about welfare reform. The President now says he is going to veto welfare reform. Everybody in the country knows welfare is out of control. There is flagrant fraud

in the welfare system. We have to do something about it. Now he says he is going to veto it.

The bottom line is, Mr. Speaker, if I were talking to America, I would say if we want a balanced budget, then we are going to have to get on with it. We are going to have to get on with it. We are going to have to slow the growth in these programs. Yes, we are going to have to cut out some bureaucracy and some governmental agencies. We intend to do that.

The President is pandering to the fears of senior citizens. He knows that the premiums for Medicare are going to have to go up, but he wants to postpone these major changes until after the next election. I am telling seniors, if they are paying attention, that after the next election these increases are going to be there, but they are going to be bigger, because we will have postponed them for a year. We want to deal with the problem now. We want to deal with it in an equitable and fair way.

The benefits will continue to go up. The premiums are going to go up a little bit. There is no question about it. But we know that the Medicare system is going to fail if we do not do something. The President's commission said it is going to go bankrupt if we do not do something, so we are trying to do it in a responsible way, and he is down there at the White House with his glasses down over his nose, vetoing it, saying he is going to save it for seniors.

The fact of the matter is he knows, we all know, we are going to have to deal with that problem. We want to deal with it now, in an equitable way, so the pain they are going to feel in a year is not as severe as it would be right now.

We have no deal with the budget deficits. We are at \$5 trillion. In a few years it will be \$7 trillion. The interest alone on the debt will be so high we will not be able to manage this Government without printing money and causing hyperinflation. We have to control the deficit. We have to balance the budget, and we have a plan to do it in 7 years.

He does not want to do. He says how about 9 years, 10 years, 11 years. There is going to be no end to it, America. We will never have a balanced budget until we make the decision to do it. We want to do it now. We want to hold the President's feet to the fire. I think that is what America wants. If we do not do it now, it will never happen, and we will rue the day that we turned our backs on this opportunity.

#### WHY CRITICIZE THE PRESIDENT WHEN THE HOUSE HAS NOT COMPLETED ITS WORK ON APPROPRIATIONS?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I would be glad for my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] to come back. I think the gentleman and I agree on most of what the gentleman has said, not everything. One of the things that has puzzled me about this emergency, and why we are sitting here 3 hours and 55 minutes from shutting down the Government, and we keep talking about what the President has or has not done.

It has always seemed reasonable to me that the House should have completed its work, that the budget reconciliation bill that should have been addressed by October 1, which has not been addressed, which I was told tonight at 8 o'clock the conferees were going to meet for the first time, only to be told that we are not going to meet tomorrow until 3 o'clock, but it seems to me that the House should have done its work if we are going to be criticizing the President.

What am I missing?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. If the gentleman will yield, as the gentleman well knows, we made a commitment to the American people that we were going to pass a Contract With America in the first 100 days. Because we spent the time making good on that commitment and did it in 93 days, the appropriations process was set back. He knows that.

We are trying to catch up and we will catch up. We will pass all 13 appropriation bills, as well as reconciliation, but it is a bogus argument in my opinion, and I have great respect for my colleague, the gentleman from Texas, to say that we are playing games here. The fact is we want a balanced budget and we are on a trend line to do that. The legislation we sent to the President gets us on that track.

Mr. STENHOLM. If I could reclaim my time, Mr. Speaker, there are at least 68 Democrats who agree with you.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I appreciate that.

Mr. STENHOLM. It seems to me if you have Democrats also saying balance the budget in a time certain, if you have Democrats also saying to balance the budget by the year 2002, it should not be unreasonable for us, before we shut the Government down as we are doing, that we ought to let the regular legislative process go before we start criticizing the President. It seems to me that what we ought to be doing is going ahead and doing our work.

We have wasted 5 days playing this game that we are playing. The gentleman and I do not want to play games, we say. At least he has made a speech, it was excellent, on what he is for. I would want to make the same speech. But it seems to me when we are



talking about the President not engaging, under the regular legislative process that everyone in this House understands as clearly as anybody could, when you have a bill, the House passes it, the Senate passes it, you go to conference, the conference works it out, the conference then goes to the President, the President signs or vetoes the bill. If he vetoes it, then we try to override, or we start over and we start negotiating.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. If the gentleman will yield further, the fact of the matter is, and my colleague well knows, the President has stated his opposition to a number of the provisions in the short-term CR and the debt bill that he said he opposes. These are things that we believe America wants. He said he opposes them. The only way we could get around the President was to send him a bill that he could not veto.

Mr. STENHOLM. If I could reclaim my time—

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. He has chosen to shut the Government down, not us.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STENHOLM. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I find the logic strange that somehow the President ought to be questioned about his conduct before we have ever gotten appropriation bills to him. We can all have legitimate differences about what ought to happen on Medicare, what ought to happen on education. That is normal in this country. What is not normal is when you start criticizing the President for not signing legislation that has not yet been sent to him.

When the Congress has failed to pass 10 of the 13 appropriation bills, then the issue is not whether the President has vetoed something, the issue is whether the Congress has produced something for him to sign or veto. We have not yet done that, and until we do, it seems to me that it comes with considerable ill grace for this institution to suggest that we ought to short-circuit the process when this institution has not yet performed its basic duty.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STENHOLM. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HEFNER. I would like to ask a question. There is nothing in these two bills that the President is talking about vetoing, there is nothing in these bills that could not go the regular legislative route if you had done your work, or will do your work. They could be separated out. You have got the majority. You could bring them up, even under suspension, if you wanted to.

Am I right? Is that right?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. If the gentleman will continue to yield, the mi-

nority well knows that in the past there have been many, many, many times when we did not pass all the appropriations bill and we ran this place with continuing resolutions, short-term CRs. When we did that, the Democrats, when they were in charge, sent to the President of the United States things that he did not want.

Mr. HEFNER. The gentleman is not answering my question.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. The fact is you are turning everything on its head. The gentleman knows that.

#### THE EXECUTION OF NIGERIAN CITIZENS OF CONSCIENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, we are today in a democratic debate about the size and role of government. It is important and involves a need for comity of purpose on all sides.

Nevertheless, despite differences on the question of whether and how fast governmental budgets should be balanced, let us not lose sight of the fact that this is a blessed country which can manage its affairs peacefully and democratically.

I stress this point because on another continent last week, the Government of Nigeria executed the playwright Ken Saro-Wiwa and eight other human rights activists. A generation ago in her seminal work "The Origins of Totalitarianism" Hannah Arendt noted that one of the hallmarks of totalitarian regimes is the capriciousness as well as the anonymity of death.

It is therefore incumbent on democratic legislatures throughout the world to register dissent against political atrocities of this kind, and shine the spotlight of decency onto the regimes responsible.

The international community cannot allow individuals of conscience to disappear unnoted from the face of the Earth. Names must be named and deeds recorded. The courage of Ken Saro-Wiwa, a Nobel Peace Prize nominee and the President of the Movement for the Survival of the Ogoni Peoples, as well as Barinem Kiobel, Saturday Dobe, Paul Levura, Nurdy Eawo, Felix Nuata, Daniel Gbokoo, John Kpuinen, and Baribor Bara must be acknowledged and remembered.

Like Socrates, forced to drink hemlock because of his alleged corrupting influence on the youth of Athens, Ken Saro-Wiwa was found guilty of crimes committed by others because his enlightened human rights advocacy was said to have created the environment that fostered societal misdeeds. As the lessons of Socrates' life and the injustice of his death 2½ millennia ago are recalled, we as public officials in a free society must today demand account-

ability for the execution of these 20th century Nigerian citizens of conscience.

In referencing this human rights tragedy, I do not mean to divert attention from the importance of the debate this evening, but this Congress, despite our problems, remains the principal legislative beacon of freedom in the world. We are obligated to resolve our differences. We are also obligated to put our problems in perspective. Important differences of judgment exist, but we can reach a consensus without putting a gun to anyone's head. We are, after all, Americans.

#### GOAL OF BALANCED BUDGET NOT EXCLUSIVE TO REPUBLICAN PARTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

THE LEADERSHIP'S INABILITY TO SUBMIT TO THE PRESIDENT LEGISLATION HE CAN SIGN

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I rise here to speak to the issue that we are talking about tonight, the inability of the Republican leadership, Speaker GINGRICH and the leader of the other body, to bring to us and take to the President a continuing resolution and an extension of the debt ceiling which he will sign.

I do that with a special interest tonight, because I have two constituents here with me in the gallery who are nurses in my district. They are very concerned. They are concerned that we continue the commitment that we have in this country to seniors through our Medicare Program, to others through our Medicaid Program, and to their colleagues, who work in Federal facilities, so I appreciate the gentleman giving me a moment to make sure that we remember there are real people who are being discussed in these issues. This is not just theoretical.

□ 2015

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, apropos of the remarks of the gentleman from Kentucky, reference has been made again and again this evening and in previous sessions of the House to a balanced budget, and reference has been made to the President. In fact, the President has been castigated for being unwilling, presumably, to move towards a balanced budget in a time certain, generally given to be 2002.

What is constantly left out of the equation is that there is no presentation for a balanced budget. Every time I hear that being said very frankly by Members on both sides, but most

particularly as a kind of challenge from the Republic side, I would find it amusing if it was not so sad that this is based upon a palpable fraud. I will tell you exactly what it is. It is no great secret.

In previous times, Mr. Speaker, in order to mask the deficit that was accumulating, we have gone into what is called something off-budget. It is a bookkeeping trick. That is all it is, the Social Security trust fund. But before, at least we were honest about it with respect that it appeared from both the Republicans and the Democrats when we finally put budgets together that we were, in fact, utilizing the so-called surplus funds in order to achieve a budget. We were not pretending that we were trying to balance the budget at that point.

As the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM] and others who have preceded me have indicated, that has been a goal of both Democrats and Republicans. This is not exclusive to the Republican Party. But the difference has been that there was not the stench of mendacity in the air as I very sadly detect now.

The plain, simple fact of the matter is that in the budget as presented by the Republican Party, we are going to take in the neighborhood of \$636 billion out of a so-called surplus in the Social Security fund in order to balance the budget in the year 2002. We start in 1996 with \$63 billion. There is \$115 billion scheduled to be taken in the year 2002 in order to achieve a balanced budget.

Now, this is supposed to be coming from surplus funds. So I put the challenge to those who will say that this is truly going to be a balanced budget as presented by the Republican Party in this House in 2002. If that is a surplus, then give it back. If you do not need to have an IOU to the Social Security trust fund in the year 2002 of \$630 plus billion, let us hear it on this floor. I can come down here for special orders any night; I invite anybody to come down now and say that what I am saying is not true.

I see a smile on the face of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM]. He knows that this is the case. My good friend from Indiana is not smiling, he is grimacing at the moment. But the plain fact is that while there are people in this body who are serious about balancing the budget, they are serious in a way that says that they will not try to fool the American people into thinking, because we have done a bookkeeping trick, namely putting it off budget, that phraseology, a phrase of art with respect to accounting, that we will not owe that money to the Social Security trust fund.

There will be no balanced budget in 2002, and I would hope that the next Republican Member who gets up and recites this mantra will at least have the common decency to respect the in-

telligence of the American people who can add and subtract and read and write the numbers just as well as anybody else and admit that in the year 2002 when they claim, providing nothing goes wrong whatsoever with the projections, when they claim that there will be a balanced budget, on that day, at that moment, they will owe \$630 plus billion to the Social Security trust fund.

If we are going to balance the budget, I welcome the debate. Let us get to it, let us try and figure out how to do it, but let us be honest about it. Let us not start accusing anybody in this body, particularly on our side of the aisle, of being less than true to their faith, the faith that they have in what they want to do, and come forward with sensible, reasonable, honest figures with respect to the balanced budget.

#### MAINTAINING THE CURRENT MEDICARE RATIO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. KIM] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KIM. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that having a continuing resolution which would leave the government open is in jeopardy because of this premium part B on Medicare Program. I wish the people in California would listen to me tonight. I want to tell you exactly what the part B in Medicare plan is all about so you can make your own judgment of who is right and who is wrong.

I do not think we, the Republican Party, is doing such a good job to communicate with the people. I am going to do my best tonight.

Let us take a look at this chart here. Right now beneficiaries, senior citizens, only pay one-third of the total cost of the part B, which is to pay for the doctor's fee. Two-thirds, a little more than two-thirds is paid by the other taxpayers, roughly 68.5 percent. Many people did not know that. My district people did not know it. I did not know we had been subsidizing it. They are so busy working every day, they did not pay attention to exactly what the part B premium is about.

Mr. Speaker, it used to be 50-50. Half of it paid by the beneficiary and the other half is subsidized by the other taxpayers.

Now what has happened? One-third is paid by the beneficiary; two-thirds is being subsidized by the other taxpayers, the working people. Who are those people? Some of those people cannot even afford to buy their own insurance, but they have to subsidize senior citizens by two-thirds. Under the current system starting January 1, it is going to change even greater: 25 percent by the beneficiary and 75 percent by the other taxpayers' subsidy.

That is not fair. That is what we are saying.

We are saying that we have to keep this ratio, one-third, two-third ratio. That does not increase anyone; that is all. For that we have been criticized unfairly.

Is it wrong that we would like to maintain this one-third/two-third ratio? A senior citizen only pay one-third of the premium and two-thirds subsidized by the younger people? Is that unfair, keeping this ratio? Why does it have to go to 25 and 75 percent relationship? How can you balance the budget when you have to spend this kind of money, additional spending, to subsidize beneficiaries? How can you possibly balance the budget?

We are not cutting anything, we are trying to maintain the same ratio. By doing this, as you know, medical costs keep going up. By doing this, everybody has to pay a little more, a few bucks a month, just to maintain this relationship. We are not increasing anything, just maintaining one-third/two-thirds relationship.

Mr. Speaker, it is not right that we are asking those people out there working every day making \$50,000 a year, trying to support the family, trying to send the kids to school, trying to make the mortgage payment, let them at the same time subsidize senior citizens by more than two-thirds.

Now, when our country is in this shape financially, yes, let us increase that, maybe 100 percent, but right now we are in financial crisis. Our debt is \$4.9 trillion. Our interest payment alone last year was \$230 billion, about the same as our national defense budget. Under that kind of circumstances, we are going to ask them to pay more?

I have to set the record straight. People can see me. I apologize that the chart is kind of messy, but I have to speak to you tonight to get the facts straight. If you do not think that that is fair, then let us know. That is all we are trying to do, maintain this current ratio. For that, our President is going to veto the entire continuing resolution I think is very unfair.

#### CRUCIAL DEBATE ABOUT THE SURVIVAL OF SENIOR CITIZENS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I was in my office working and many of the staff members were there with me, because obviously, we are preparing for the onslaught of questions that will probably be coming from many of our constituents in the 18th Congressional District.

I listened to the debate, particularly by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER], and I would like to yield to him, because I do not know about



the plain facts that our colleague on the other side of the aisle was mentioning about Medicare part B.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know about the gentleman from North Carolina, but I know the plain facts that today my senior citizens pay \$43, and under the Republican plan in a few months, maybe just about 30 days, they will be paying \$53.

I have had my senior citizens tell me, I do not know where I am going to get the money from. This is not a battle of who is chicken and who is not, this is not a battle of who has one-upmanship; this is a crucial debate about the survival of my senior citizens and citizens across this Nation and the Medicare system.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, people making \$50,000 a year, which is certainly not rich, but people living in my district on a fixed income for an increased of \$10 or \$12 a month, many times depend on where they are going to buy their groceries or get their prescriptions filled and what have you, it is a tremendous burden.

Also, I would like to have asked the gentleman the question that if we are going to put \$270 billion, and make no mistake about it, it is a cut, \$270 billion, then you cannot have the \$240 billion tax cut unless that is scored by CBO. You have to have the Medicare cuts before you can have the tax cuts. Everybody acknowledges that.

So if you are going to make the \$270 billion cuts in Medicare, why not apply them to make the Medicare fund more secure; either that, or reduce the deficit. This does not make any sense to burden our senior citizens with an increase in premiums simply to have a tax cut almost corresponding to the same dollar amounts, from the \$270 billion you are going to make in Medicare to give a \$240 billion tax cut.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman can talk about it all he wants, but there are going to be cuts and there are going to be cuts to supply the funds for a tax cut. It does not make any sense to put that burden on our senior citizens.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I think that is an excellent explanation, and that is why I came over, because it concerns me when many of my constituents are raising the question of what is happening here in the U.S. Congress.

I would like to just briefly relate to them the lack of progress that we have made. Frankly, under the Republican majority, they have not done their job. These appropriations bills were supposed to be passed in early September, and if they had been passed at that time period, we would not have reached this point, this time, this day.

All that we are asking as a Congress, and particularly those of us on the

Democratic side of the aisle, is that let us just deal with the issue at hand. The issue at hand simply allows us to have one, a continuing resolution to allow this discussion to go forth and the doors of the Government to stay open; and then second, allows the debt ceiling to increase so that this country does not default on its obligations.

We have a philosophical difference, and that is understandable, but I do not think the American people should be misdirected and misrepresented that there is some reason that we have come to this, other than the fact that the appropriations bills that should have been passed in September were not passed. Why is that? Because there is some magic number to the number seven in terms of balancing the budget, when in actuality, we have looked at the President's budget, we may have wanted to improve that budget, but that is a 9-year budget. Is there some difference, something magic between 7 and 9?

When you begin to look at the direction that the Republicans' 7-year budget takes, cuts in school lunches, cuts in Medicaid, children's programs, cuts in student loans, ending nursing home regulations where many of your parents are staying; a lack of worker safety regulations, curbing food and drug standards, forgetting the environment, criminalizing various procedures dealing with the question, the very private question of women to choose; ending the national service group, and of course, cutting science and research. All of these issues were part of the appropriations bills when we should have been able to discuss these separate and apart from that process.

□ 2030

Do you want nursing home regulations to be eliminated? Do you want to eliminate the progress we have made with respect to environmental protection? These debates should be separate and apart from the question of whether the doors of this Government stay open.

Just this past weekend, I spent Veterans Day acknowledging the many veterans in our community and saluting them for the service they have given. In addition to saluting my veterans, many of them asked the questions, not only about themselves but about those who would come after them that would be denied benefits.

I had Federal workers working with me on their day off to give constituency service in my congressional office, meaning those in Social Security and those working in other agencies. Those are the ones that are going to be counted out.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply ask, let us be reasonable. Deal with the issue at hand so the American people can have faith in their Congress again, get back to the business that we have, and that

is the business of running this Government properly, making sure that a budget is balanced but is not balanced on the least of those that we have in this country. Let us be realistic, both Republicans and Democrats. Keep doors open so that we can face this together, and make sure that we are having a budget that answers the concerns of all Americans, and not cut it on the backs of children and senior citizens.

#### RHETORICAL AND SUBSTANTIVE DIFFERENCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARR). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. TAUZIN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I got a call from a good friend of mine tonight. His question was, what is this big difference of opinion between the White House and the Congress? What is it all about, and what can we do about it in the short time that remains?

As we discussed it, it occurred to me that maybe the differences are not as wide as we think they are, at least in rhetoric, and maybe they are wider than we would like them to be perhaps in substance.

In rhetoric, the President of the United States in 1993 appeared on "Larry King Live" and promised a 5-year plan to balance the budget, not a 10-year plan like he came out with in 1995. A 5-year plan. This year, just recently he said, "Well, maybe I could go along with a 7-year plan. Maybe I could, if I liked the way it was done." But in 1993 he promised a 5-year plan. You would think we could come together tonight.

Also in 1993, the President spoke out very forcefully and I think very courageously on the question of Medicare and Medicaid. His words then were that we cannot let these two programs grow at three times the rate of inflation without them going bankrupt or bankrupting our future. He called for a reduction in growth.

In fact, in his 10-year budget plan this year he called for a \$192 billion reduction in the growth of Medicare. That is on the same baseline we use here in Congress. He called for a \$120 billion reduction in the growth in Medicaid according to our congressional baseline. That is some pretty severe reductions in growth.

Our Democratic leadership would call that cuts. The President said, "Don't call that a cut." He said, "I'm talking about reducing the growth of the spending out of these programs, the excessive amount they spend, because they are driving the programs and our future into bankruptcy." At least the President said that.

You would think perhaps we are closer than we think tonight, because if we are talking about reducing the growth

in Medicare and Medicaid, the President himself has conceded that that has to get done and he has recommended some pretty healthy reductions in the growth in Medicare and Medicaid.

Finally, the President in 1992 when he ran for election, when he asked us all to vote for him, promised a middle-class tax cut. He did not give us one. What he did last year was to raise taxes.

Just recently he appeared before a group of supporters and said, "I know you think I raised your taxes too much, and guess what, I think I did, too." You would think the President would be supporting a balanced budget plan that included some tax relief for Americans.

You could think we would be a lot closer than we are tonight. In fact, we are not. The reason we are not closer than we think tonight is that those who want a clean CR, those who want no changes in the way this Government operates and spends money, those who want us to send the President a clean CR, a clean extension of the debt, simply want to keep on going like we are going. That is wrong.

The President knows that is wrong, you know that is wrong, I know that is wrong. The President has said he believes we ought to balance this budget in at least 5 years, or 7, or 10. He believes that Americans deserve a tax cut, he taxed them too much last year, and he believes we need to reduce the growth in Medicare and Medicaid spending.

One would think we could come to terms tonight. What holds us apart? One, we have a majority in this House but not a two-thirds majority. We have got a majority in the Senate but not 60 votes to override a filibuster attempt, nor a two-thirds majority to override a veto. So the President can use his veto pen to stop changes here in Congress that he opposes.

What kind of changes? Changes like changes in the regulations of this country. When you hear this talk tonight about, well, we are going to have dirty water and dirty air and dirty food as a result of what we are proposing, remember, this House voted for changes in the way regulations are made in those areas, to require a simple cost-benefit analysis. That is all that is in the CR, just the regulatory reform this House voted upon.

You would think that there was something awful about the Congress trying to reform the Medicare Program, but the President himself said it has to get done. His trustees said if you do not do it in 7 years, your parents and my parents will not have a Medicare Program to depend upon because it is going bankrupt.

You would think that there would be an interest in this House, in this Chamber and the other Chamber, to come to

some kind of conclusion on a good Medicare reform. We have tried to deliver one, and this House passed one, but we do not have two-thirds to get it through. We do not have 60 votes to get it past a filibuster in the Senate, and so the red pen is being waved tonight.

There is a big difference in substance, not much difference in rhetoric but a big difference in substance. Hopefully in the next few days those differences can be resolved and we can get about the business of reforming this country and bringing a balanced budget for our future and our children.

#### BALANCING THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to take stock at this time, while we have a lot of focus on what the Congress is trying to do, to look at where we have come from in this first session of the 104th Congress.

We passed the regulatory reform that Congressman TAUZIN was speaking of. We passed the line-item veto to take care of eliminating the pork-barrel legislation and excessive spending. We have passed the prohibition of unfunded mandates so that our local governments will not have items we passed back to the local government without the funding that goes with it.

We have already passed \$90 billion in deficit reduction, \$190 billion in spending reductions, and now we have the possibility, if the President agrees, to balance the budget, something that every other government has to do, every family has to do. The State government has to balance its budget, county governments, school governments.

The economic experts, Mr. Speaker, have told us that if we can balance the budget so we do not have to spend so much of the tax dollars to pay for the debt, we will have a reduction of mortgage payments for our fellow Americans, we will reduce the car payments, we will reduce the college payments. We will be able to make sure that our goal will be that we are taking care of essential services for people and not the Government waste and fraud that we have seen that the Federal Government has had for years.

We will also see with our tax reform proposals, if they get adopted again and signed into law by the President, a \$500 per child tax credit. We will have the new IRA programs with \$2,000 for individuals, \$4,000 for a couple. We will roll back that unfair 1993 Social Security tax on our senior citizens. We will give our seniors the opportunity to make more than \$11,280 who are under 70 without having a bite out of the Social Security. Under our new proposal, it will be up to \$30,000 a year.

We will also have capital gains tax reductions for individuals of 19 percent, 25 percent for businesses. This will allow us to have new jobs, expansion of businesses, and also increase savings. Adoption tax credit is included within this proposal, as well as an elder care tax credit.

We are on our way, Mr. Speaker, with many new reforms in this 104th Congress, but the balanced budget awaits the President's signature. He has said he is committed to a balanced budget. Both sides of the aisle have supported the concept of a balanced budget. It works in business. It works in our families. It can work for the country. But we need the President to come to the table to work with our congressional leadership in the House and Senate in a bipartisan fashion. If we do that, we are going to help our senior citizens, we are going to help our working families, and we are going to help our children. We can make a difference. We ask for the President to come to the table and help us make it happen.

#### EDUCATION: AN ISSUE WHICH UNITES US

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, we are at a critical moment in the life of the American democracy. I think it would be helpful if we lower our voices and come together on an issue which unites us. Education is that issue.

On this Wednesday, the day after tomorrow, National Education Funding Support Day has been proclaimed. It is important to note at this point that education has always been an issue that has received bipartisan support.

Education is an investment. It has always been recognized by both Democrats and Republicans as an investment. Only this year has Republican extremism and recklessness led to a division that has critically injured the support for education in the Congress.

On our National Education Funding Support Day, we hope that we can reach out to both sides, both Republicans and Democrats. We hope that we can get the American people to understand what is at stake in the Federal support for education.

I think to have something now which leads us to lower our voices and come together would be a good thing. Despite all of the heated rhetoric of the next few days, and despite the fact that there are real issues on the table and very important decisions to be made, I think it would be good if we sort out something that we can agree on, and education is the one thing in the past that we have agreed on.

It is time for some effort to calm the waters. Like the gentlewoman from



Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER], I happened to hear part of the GOPAC celebration. It was on C-SPAN this morning. I could not avoid it. It was on a respectable media outlet, and I heard part of Rush Limbaugh's speech to the GOPAC audience here in Washington.

He was addressing a crowd of people who seemed to need at this time some therapy, so Rush the jester, he is the Speaker's jester, became Rush the therapist. It was very interesting to watch how he was calming the fears of the GOPAC crowd that the American people have misunderstood them. He kept telling them do not be anxious, do not be bitter; the American people are going to understand you sooner or later.

The fact that the Republican extremism policies have taken a great plunge in the polls, a Wall Street Journal poll shows that more than 60 percent want the President to veto the Republican budget, and more than 70 percent are against the Medicare cuts, has led to some serious soul-searching among Republicans. So Rush Limbaugh was there spreading his arms to calm down Republican fears.

I thought that was very interesting. Everybody needs something at this point to calm them down, and certainly to come together on an issue like education I think would have a calming influence.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OWENS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I would just say to the gentleman that he is talking about some of the fears and some of the concerns that the American people have at this point in time. He talked about some of the objections to cuts in very, very important programs that are helpful to senior citizens and students that are trying to get back to school.

This is not a poll from a Democratic pollster. It is not a poll from the President's White House. It is a CNN/USA Today poll that recently showed that 75 percent of the American people are against the tragic cuts in the Medicare Program, and 74 percent of the American people are against the cuts in the student loan program. This is not political information, not driven by pollsters from our party or pollsters from the other side of the aisle. This is a poll taken directly by an objective, very reliable and very respected firm.

What we are saying, and I serve on the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities with the distinguished gentleman from New York, is that we have always agreed that education can and should be an investment for our workers, for our senior citizens, going back to school to learn more and contribute to the economy when they are not making enough money from Social Security or getting help from

Medicare, from workers that have been on the assembly line doing the same thing for 20 years, screwing a screw into a door, and now that assembly line has changed dramatically, and they are working on a computer and working in teams to create a better quality product.

□ 2045

This is no time to be cutting off their loans for college education, whether they are 55 years old or 25 years old. I just wanted to point out the two things that I very much agree with the gentleman from New York, that education should be bipartisan, and that, second, the American people are against these education cuts at 74 percent of the people against these cuts.

Mr. OWENS. I thank the gentleman very much. He has made a very compact, well-focused statement which would make it unnecessary for me to say a great deal of what I was going to say. The American people have shown consistently over the years that education is a high priority.

It is interesting now that I think it is clear that health care is the first priority but education is a close parallel, almost the second priority, almost a parallel priority of the American people. So education should not be forgotten in this great debate.

Education Funding Support Day, November 15, day after tomorrow, is designed to have the American people reinforce what they have already shown in the polls. They keep stating over and over again, in poll after poll, that education is a high priority. Yet the public officials who make the decisions keep cutting education. At the city level in New York, over the last few years, we have lost \$2 billion. New York is a system which serves a million students. We have lost \$2 billion over the last 5 years in education funding at a time when more children have come into the system. The State has now cut the State aid for New York City a great deal, and, of course, at the Federal level we had \$4 billion of cuts recently proposed by the Republican budget.

Republican extremism and recklessness is being ratcheted upward at a time when there is no war, no real crisis; a catastrophe is being manufactured.

It is not the President who is being blackmailed, as we have heard over and over again. It is the American people who are being blackmailed. The children are being blackmailed. The students are being blackmailed.

Let us pause for a moment to reconsider what is happening. I hope the Republicans will join the Democrats in supporting National Education Funding Support Day and try to refocus on the bipartisan effort we have made over the years on education.

In the days before Republican extremism, education was a unifying issue,

even more so than defense. I have seen many votes on the floor of this house where a greater proportion of the body voted for education than voted for defense, which was also a unifying issue. But we had more votes on education bills. Many of the authorizing bills for education on this floor have received almost unanimous approval.

We have gone through a process at the committee level where at the committee level there was a great debate, in the conferences there was a great debate. In fact, some of our conferences have gone on for several weeks. Many committee markups have gone on for days. So we have had great debates on education, with each side, of course, offering varied opinions, and there are some differences. In the end, both Republicans and Democrats came together on education, and we need to try to get back to that. We could assert ourselves in the next few days and reach some kind of agreement to communicate to the President that both parties agree that we should rescind that \$4 billion in education cuts and deal with making cuts somewhere else to facilitate moving matters forward.

In the days before Republican extremism. Education was a unifying issue, even more so than defense. Under Republican Reagan, under Republican Bush, we had major steps taken toward the offering of guidance by the Federal Government in the area of education. Education reform was taken on by the Federal Government as a major responsibility. Republican Ronald Reagan had the commission to publish the report, "A Nation at Risk," and he launched the effort. Bush followed with America 2000 and the six goals that were set forth at the Governors' conference in Virginia. President Clinton attended that conference, where the Governors set forth the six goals for education, and President Clinton has steadfastly enforced those goals.

President Clinton has taken America 2000 that was put forward by Bush and launched Education 2000, which, in many ways, has the same basic foundation. So we have a continuation of bipartisan support for education.

On November 15, day after tomorrow, we want to reemphasize that and let the American people know that we continue to have this major goal of pushing education forward as a bipartisan concern.

Republican extremism wrecked the bipartisan support for education this time. This is at a time, unfortunately, where education is needed more than ever before.

As I have said many times before, our economy, our society is at a critical transition period. Our society is now in a period where the economy is booming, Wall Street is booming, the stock market is booming, profits are higher than they have been for a long, long

time. And yet, on the other hand, people are losing jobs through downsizing and streamlining.

The American wages have suffered a dramatic decline over the last two decades, the last 20 years. So we are in a transition period, a period unlike any that we have ever experienced before. It is necessary more than ever that we step forward with a new investment in education. Not less should be invested in education, but we should be investing more in education. We should invest more at this particular period because we are making a transition where education and greater training will be needed.

You know, I think last night, whenever this GOPAC celebration was held, I heard it this morning on C-SPAN, Rush Limbaugh kept saying that if you cannot make it in America, it is your fault; you know, nobody should ask for help. If you cannot make it in America, it is really your fault. It is very strange that Rush Limbaugh, a talk show host who is dependent on the airwaves, radio and television, which are a government, you know, they are government-facilitated outlets, you know, he would not be a millionaire and a superstar if there were no FCC, if there were no Federal Communications Commission, a government body which regulates and helps to nurture the whole broadcast industry from its inception to the present. He would not be there. Rush Limbaugh should send a "thank you" letter to the FCC every day.

The U.S. Navy helped perfect radio and helped perfect the kind of things that made it necessary for radio to move from radio to television, the orderly transition, the development of a whole industry. The broadcast industry was not charged any money every time they used the airwaves. Yet the broadcast industry was not unlimited, not every American could gain access to the broadcast industry, not every American could be a talk show host, because the broadcast airwaves are owned by certain companies. There are a limited number. If we did not have a government which regulated that limited number, then you would have chaos and nobody would be able to have signals that got through.

So, you know, the FCC, the U.S. Navy, the space program, and all of the Government research that went on with radar and various defense industries that made it possible to develop, you know, the compact kind of technology that allows you to have transistors and to do the marvelous things we do with television sets and with radio and all the things that facilitate cable television and all the things that are going on now which make people like Rush Limbaugh rich, all of them are maintained by a society and a Government that, if it did not exist and did not carry out these functions, the opportunity would not be there for Rush Limbaugh and his kind.

The illogical rationalization that is going on, the monstrous excuse that Republican extremists are making is that we need to inflict these cruel and unusual budget cuts, these measures which go after everything from Medicare, Medicaid, to education, we need to inflict these measures on the elderly, on children and on students in order to save future children from debts.

Men and women who have no compassion for living, breathing Americans want us to believe that they have great compassion for the children of the future, they have compassion for posterity. They want to trade the compassion of today that requires a few sacrifices by the rich for the cheap abstract compassion of the distant future, have compassion for posterity, have compassion for the children of the future, but do not have compassion for the living, breathing, elderly who are sick and need health care today, do not have compassion for the students who want an opportunity to get through school, to have decent lunches so that they are not hungry and can learn, the students who want to get through college on Pell grants and student loans; do not have any compassion for them. Let us think about the children of the future, the children to come, not the children of today; let us think about the students of the future, students to come, not the children of today.

Compassion is a concern, and it is one concern we should always bear in mind. We should always be concerned with compassion. I think compassion might be interpreted as a willingness to share the benefits of society with everybody in the society because we recognize that all human life is sacred. Merely by being born, all human beings deserve compassion. Medicare and Medicaid are expressions of compassion, very important expressions of compassion. The elderly and the children probably deserve the most compassion in our society. So compassion is important.

Compassion is a basic value of the American majority. I think most people in America have compassion. They want their Government to reflect a concern with compassion. They want their decisionmakers, their congressmen as well as their State legislators and their local legislators to always move in ways that show that they care about people.

The great majority of the American people are caring people. There is a caring majority out there, and the caring majority has reflected its sentiments. They have aroused themselves, and they are being felt in the public opinion polls. They are showing through the polls that they do not care for this extremism. They want it stopped. It is not consistent with American compassion. It is not consistent with the caring majority.

But while I am very concerned about compassion, I am talking about edu-

cation today, and education is an investment. It is not a matter of compassion. Support for education programs does not represent compassion. Support for education programs represents a commonsense investment in the future of America. Support for education means you care about young people being able to get an opportunity so they can help themselves. You care about young people being able to get an opportunity so they will keep our economy going. If young people are not out there working in our economy, they will not produce the taxes that we need, they will not produce the money to fund the social security fund. It is working young people in the American economy who make the economy go.

I read in the Wall Street Journal today that China is leaping forward at a far more rapid rate than anybody ever predicted. China, China, when I was in school, I remember in the geography books always that phrase, "China is a backward country." The implication was that Chinese are backward people; inevitably China will always be at the bottom of the heap; all those people there, they gave the impression that they will never do anything but trip all over themselves and cause chaos and China will never be a force in the world.

Well, now, China may be bidding to become the third largest economy in the world merely by the fact that they exist, a billion people. You know, a billion people just selling things back and forth to each other creates quite an economy.

The Chinese suddenly have leaped into the export market. This Wall Street Journal article said the Chinese may surpass the Japanese in terms of exports to America soon and that the Chinese are seeking to protect their position in the world through the GATT treaty. They know that, as they become more and more of an export power, they are going to be the victims of attempts at restrictions of trade from China, so they are getting ready.

The article continued to say it surprised everybody because the Chinese are not a high technology society in the same sense as Japan or West Germany, France, a lot of the other industrialized societies. China is leaping forward partially because of its tremendous organization of the one greatest resource it does have, and the greatest resource the Chinese have is people. Human beings are their greatest resources.

Whatever you may say about the totalitarian government of China, they have invested in education. They know that good schools are a great investment. They have made an investment in education.

□ 2100

They have human beings who are well organized and who, despite the



fact that they may have a technological disadvantage, are able to produce a great deal because of the fact that they are well-organized, well-trained, well-focused.

So the Chinese, who were called backwards when I was in the third grade, are going to leap forward as a major world economy, and they are going to dislocate children in our economy. The children in our economy who are going to be adults, if they do not have a great deal of training, they cannot stay way ahead of the Chinese in technology, and they lose, because our policies are such that most of what is being exported from China to America is being financed by American companies.

The Chinese are getting rich off of the American Fortune 500 corporations, who make contracts for them to make goods at very low cost that they then bring back to our economy and sell. So pretty soon we are going to wipe out this great consumer market that we have created over the years by having fair policies, by having strong labor unions, by having a situation that generated a massive number of people who have a lot of money, enough money to be able to buy consumer products in large quantities.

We are destroying the great engine that has driven the free world economy for the last 50 years. We are going to destroy American consumers by not educating them properly and by having trade policies that allow our economy to be invaded by a country that has seen the benefits of educating their population and taken advantage of all the loopholes in the international trade policies.

In the midst of the storm that is going to rage for the next few days, I hope no more than a few days, but maybe weeks, we would like for there to be one dry spot. We would like for there to be one shaft of bipartisan light. We would like for education to return to be understood to be the core of our prosperity. Education must remain at the core of our prosperity. We must understand that education is at the core of our prosperity. We must act that way. We must understand that education is the most practical investment that we can make in America.

We cannot afford to go forward and continue the bipartisan bickering and smother everything. Let us return at least to an understanding that health care, the American people have ranked health care as one of those top priorities, and education has been ranked as another tomorrow priority, almost equal to health care.

So in the next few days, I hope that the President and the Republican-controlled Congress will stop and think seriously about what is going on and say that, look, health care should come first, education should come second, and then let us take a look at every-

thing else if you want to balance the budget. And let us get off this extreme drive, this extreme, dogmatic notion that you have to balance the budget in 7 years.

Those who want to balance the budget, we ought to be able to reason with them and say 10 years instead of 7 years, and maybe we should lock in the law so there could be no reneging on that 10 years. But 10 years to balance the budget would be a better approach, a less extreme approach. It would not require that we throw education overboard as an investment. It would not require that we throw large numbers of senior citizens overboard in their life and death situations day-in and day-out. We do not have to do things in an extreme and mean way. We could do it in a more rational way over a longer period of time and achieve the same objective.

So we are at a critical moment in the life of American democracy. We are at a critical moment, and I think that the proclamation of National Education Funding Support Day by an organization which I helped to fund, the National Commission for African-American Education, took the lead in proclaiming that November 15 would be National Education Funding Support Day. November 15 happens to be in the middle of American Education Week, so we are following a tradition. A lot of different school boards and school systems around the country have open school week during this time. So it is an appropriate time to try to link up with what is happening in education in the localities with what is happening in Washington.

The Federal Government is responsible for only a small portion of the total American education budget. We only supply about 7 percent. It went up as high as 8 percent at one time. But we only supply about 7 percent of the total education budget. Local governments and State governments supply the rest. And it is probably going to be much that same way for a long time. I really think the Federal Government should be more involved. We should be more like the other industrialized nations. All other industrialized nations have a greater participation in education by their central governments than the United States of America.

China has a greater participation, and they have taken advantage of the use of education to turn their population into an asset. All other nations, the nations of Asia, the Asian rim that is bursting with economic activity, a great investment has been made by Singapore. A great investment has been made by Taiwan.

When I was in Taiwan you saw students going to school at all hours of the night. Their schools operated around the clock. They had computers that they were using to train students. Those computers got no rest. They had

shifts of students who were going to school around the clock to take advantage of the equipment and the space that they had. They understood the value of investment in education.

We should lower our voices and get our senses together and look at the world with practical eyes. We want compassion, but in addition to compassion, there is just common sense and survival that is at stake here.

Education is a matter of survival. Education has to be moved up to a place in the national security pantheon. Education may be far more important than weapon systems that we are spending great amounts of money on.

Expenditures for education would be far more productive than further expenditures on the *Seawolf* submarine. Expenditures for education would be much more productive than expenditures we are undertaking for the F-22 fighter plane manufactured in Speaker GINGRICH's district in Marietta, GA. They would certainly be far more productive than the CIA expenditures that we continue.

We continue to expend at least \$28 billion for the CIA. That is the conservative figure, because we do not know the real figure. At least \$28 billion per year is being spent for the CIA. That is a great waste. Some of that money is being wasted. If you just cut the CIA by 10 percent a year, \$2.8 billion for the next 5 years, you would generate a great amount of money that could be applied to education.

Education is suffering. You can balance the budget and not hurt your scheme of things by just taking the money from the defunct, dangerous CIA, and moving it over to education.

The CIA is a dangerous institution. I thought it was very interesting that a great deal of furor was generated by the Secretary of Energy, Mrs. O'Leary, a great deal of furor was generated when it was found that she had misspent money on a study which studied the media, newspapers and journalists, and studied how they covered her agency. I agree, it is a great waste of money. I agree that she certainly should be chastised. I agree that certainly some steps should be taken to deal with the people who came up with that bright idea.

However, I found it very interesting that immediately there was a loud cry for her dismissal. Yet the CIA found a slush fund just a few months ago, the CIA found a slush fund, a petty cash fund that nobody knew about, of \$1.5 billion, at least. I am told by somebody who knows that it was more than that. They could not tell me exactly how much. A petty cash fund of \$1.5 billion was discovered at the CIA, and the director of the CIA said that he did not know about it. It has existed for some time because it takes time to build up a petty cash slush fund that nobody is

really accountable for of \$1.5 billion. And yet nobody called for any dismissal of anybody. I did not hear anybody say the CIA director ought to be fired. I did not hear anybody say that some top people at the CIA, at least the bookkeeper, ought to be fired. I do not know if anybody got fired as a result of the discovery of a \$1.5 billion-plus slush fund.

That is surprising, and it is something the American people with their common sense ought to take a close look at. Where is the money being wasted in our government? The money we need to invest in education, where is it? I can find it for you. I can find it for you. \$1.5 billion in the CIA slush fund, we are off to a good beginning.

A little while before that we discovered that the CIA had in process the building of a building which cost almost \$400 million. A building, a facility, is being constructed near the Dulles Airport by the CIA, and nobody knew about it. The members of the Intelligence Committee on Oversight here in the House of Representatives said they did not know about it. The Members of the Committee on Oversight in the Senate said they did not know about it.

How do you construct a \$400 million building, \$370 million-some to be exact, how do you construct a building that costs that much money near Dulles Airport and nobody in the government who has oversight responsibility for the CIA knows about it? And when you find that kind of mistake, why do they not call for somebody to be fired? Who got fired? Who got fired?

We recall that Aldrich Ames was discovered to be a Soviet agent. Aldrich Ames was not a small guy down the line. Aldrich Ames was in charge of the American espionage operation in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. He was in charge.

He had an interesting history. His father had been in the CIA before, and he had risen through the ranks, although people always wondered about the fact he was not very bright. They wondered about the fact that he did drink too much. They wondered about the fact he broke various rules.

He used the CIA safe houses for fornication regularly. He got away with all this. Then he had a lavish lifestyle. And the CIA makes a good salary. They are not secret. I think that you can find out what the salaries of most CIA agents are, but you cannot find out what the expense accounts are.

At any rate, the expense account plus the salary of Aldrich Ames could not have supported his standard of living. He drove expensive cars, he lived in elaborate houses, he seemed to have all the money he needed all the time. All of this went on for over 10 years. Agents died who were in the employ of the CIA. Information was compromised.

Recently the CIA in its damage control mode has released a few more facts about the damage done by Aldrich Ames. We now hear that information fed to three presidents through the channels that Aldrich Ames was responsible for was compromised information; that much of the Reagan buildup and much of the Bush buildup of defense was guided by information the Soviet Union was feeding through its bogus agents working for the United States into our decisionmaking process.

Yet, when Aldrich Ames was discovered, nobody called for the firing of the CIA Director. When the investigation was conducted and the internal report was issued, the director of the CIA at that time did not recommend the firing of a single person. It is true there was a great outcry and he finally had to resign, the Director of the CIA at that time walked away, but there was no outcry in the press, there was no outcry in Congress, for the firing of anybody.

This is the kind of America we are into. Ladies and gentlemen in America with their common sense, look under their magnifying glass of just plain common sense at what is going on here. What is going on here is we are about to have a great showdown on the budget and the appropriations process. We are about to have a showdown. And yet we have all these outrageous situations that exist, and they are not on the table for discussion. Nobody is discussing cuts in the CIA. Nobody is discussing cuts in the F-22 fighter plane that nobody needs. Nobody is discussing the B-2 bomber, which the President and Secretary of Defense say we do not need. The Joint Chiefs of Staff say we do not need the B-2 bomber. Everybody says we do not need it. Yet the Republican controlled Congress has the B-2 bomber in this great budget they are trying to cut in order to make it safe for future posterity, not to have debts.

Look at all this through the eyes of ordinary, commonsense Americans. Look at it through the eyes of Hans Christian Anderson's little boy in "The Emperor Who Had No Clothes." The emperor was naked, but the whole society was willing to go along and say the emperor was wonderfully dressed. Only one with the innocent eyes of a child, with the common sense of a child, pointed and said "Hey, the emperor is naked."

□ 2115

There are a lot of institutions that are spending a lot of their taxpayers' dollars that are naked. They do not deserve the money. We do need the money in education. We do need the money in health care. We need the money in Medicaid and we need the money in Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is that for a moment let us pause and try

to get back on track with education. Let us start with education to get back on track. Let us do what we have done for the last 10 years, have a bipartisan approach to education. Education Funding Support Day, on November 15, day after tomorrow, is a time for getting together and returning to a focus on education as something that brings us together, as an issue and a program that we very much need. Sometime the camera is going to catch the exhibits, and I would like to make sure the camera does catch the exhibits tonight.

Education Funding Support Day is November 15. We are asking parents, community leaders, union leaders, church leaders, everybody to do something out there at your school. Go to the nearest public school. We do not have to have a central direction for this or wait for flyers or wait for posters. We do not have to wait for anything. It is like the National Night Out Against Crime. Everybody is familiar with the National Night Out Against Crime. On a Tuesday night in August everybody comes out all over the country that night to show they are not afraid to come out to things, to let them know we control the streets and we are, as a society, dedicated to the proposition that we will fight crime. We will fight crime across the board, universal, at every level.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it so happens that since we have begun the National Night Out Against Crime, crime has going down dramatically. There are a lot of reasons we might cite, but one of the basic reasons, I think, is that a unified concern about crime has led to a consistent set of measures, a watchdog approach by the people that make the institutions that are related to crime and the criminal justice system function better. I expect that a National Education Funding Support Day will get the same result.

Mr. Speaker, the result will be that we will follow up on the public opinion polls that show consistently that the public supports education as a No. 1 priority for government expenditures. The polls keep showing it over and over again, but the decision-makers, at every level, keeping ignoring it. They keep ignoring the fact the public wants us to spend more money on education. It is time we stop that.

So we should go out to nearest public school and at our nearest public school we should do something positive for education. Let the fact that people are doing it all over New York City, all over New York State, all over the country, in Washington, DC, everywhere, at the same time, let that send a message to the decision-makers here in Congress, the Republican controlled Congress, the Democrats, who sometimes do not have enough enthusiasm for education also.



Let it send a message to the Governors, who are cutting education programs. Let it send a message to Governor Pataki of New York, who has made dramatic cuts in education and is proposing more cuts. Let it send a message to Mayor Giuliani, who is making cuts in New York City in education programs. And all he say as an answer to the problem is he wants to control the board of education, control the school system from city hall. And at the same time he is making these cuts and gives the impression there will be some kind of magic, that city hall is operating at so much less money that they can somehow do a different kind of job.

Well, how can they deal with the problem that existed in the New York City schools at the beginning of the school year? Mr. Speaker, 8,000 youngsters in high school and nowhere to sit when school opened. Forty in a class now in most of New York City elementary schools. Forty in a class. Equipment systems in disrepair, where they exists, and most schools have never had science equipment. Ninety percent of the schools have never had a decent computer program. On and on it goes in New York City, and most of the other big cities, in terms of education funding.

Across the country most school boards could use more money, where those that are in good shape understand they need more funding and support for improvement. Those that are falling apart, such as the big city systems, desperately need more help. And the small amount the Federal Government contributes is a small proportion, but the Federal Government sets a tone. When we make cuts in Washington, it gives credence to the cuts that are made at the State level and a new impetus for cuts to be made at the city and local level.

So we need to stop and think about what we are doing, Mr. Speaker. If we, in the midst of this crisis that has been manufactured, lower our voices and stop and reconsider, we might find that education is an issue that can bring us together. We need therapy.

I think Rush Limbaugh last night at the GOPAC meeting was on the right track. He was not cracking as many jokes as he usually cracks. He stepped from the role of being the Speaker's jester to being the Speaker's therapist. And for a moment there, I thought he might be one of the Speaker's new candidates for office, because here is the man who provides the function of comic relief coming to the rescue to calm down the Republican extremist supporters in the room because they have witnessed the uprising of common sense in American public opinion.

Mr. Speaker, American public opinion is expressing a commonsense approach to this budget crisis that has greatly frightened the Republican ex-

tremists. I know they pretend to be stalwartly forging ahead, but they understand the implications of the polls. I think they understand what happened last week in the election process. There was several election contests over the country which were clear barometers of what the American people, the voters, the taxpayers, think of the Republican extremist policies. There were clear indications that the American people reject the Republican extremist policies.

My father gave me an odd name, Mr. Speaker. My name is MAJOR not by accident. My father was a frustrated militarist. He wanted to be a soldier. He wanted to be a soldier in World War I and he was too young. They would not accept him. World War II came along and he had too many children and they would not accept him in World War II. So he took it out on me by naming me MAJOR. But he was an interesting individual. He only went to the sixth grade in school, but he could work all kinds of mathematics problems. He read all the time.

We could not afford many books. We could not afford magazines like Life magazine, for example. I do recall Life magazine always being in the house because I had an aunt who worked for rich people and she would always bring Life magazines home, and my father would always be urging her to stop bringing just back issues but to quickly liberate from the people she was working for, to get him the magazines faster so he could follow what was going on.

He read the newspaper every day and he used to particularly read the parts about the war, as World War II progressed. I was very young but I used to watch him and listen to him as he watched the arrows in the various charts that appeared in the newspaper. They used to have maps and charts and the maps would show the movement of Hitler's army across Europe. And at one time the arrow was always going forward. The invincible German army was moving forward. Always the arrows were jumping forward. And suddenly one day I came home and found a big smile on my father's face and he pointed to the arrows and he said they stopped Hitler's army at Stalingrad. They stopped Hitler's army at Stalingrad.

Stalingrad became the turning point in World War II. Not that the Russian soldiers or the Russian army was so superior to the men and women who invaded on D-Day and pushed the fight across Europe, but it was the turning point because psychologically it let the world know that Hitler's army was not invincible. The German war machine was not invincible.

Last week, Mr. Speaker, on election day, we found that the Republican juggernaut, the blitzkrieg that started in November 1994, is not invincible. It

ought to give pause to a lot of people. Common sense should tell us that the overwhelming rejection of Republican policies in Virginia and in Mississippi and Kentucky and a few other places means that the American people have awakened. They are rising up against extremism.

Extremism is foreign to American compassion. It is foreign to the caring majority philosophy. Extremism cannot survive. It cannot exist, and that is being demonstrated. So we should begin to think about how we can retreat from extremism. We should stop the ratcheting up of extremism, the recklessness that is going on. We should stop and pause and begin to look at a way to turn around.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield for filing a rule?

Mr. OWENS. No, Mr. Speaker, I will not yield.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. If the gentleman would yield just for 10 seconds, and the gentleman from Georgia, [Mr. KINGSTON] would be very happy to grant the gentleman—

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman have an announcement from the Senate or the President? I cannot yield at this point. I will yield in a few minutes.

Republican extremism is being ratcheted upwards at a time when there is no war; no real crisis. A catastrophe is being manufactured. Earlier speakers have said it. I don't want to be redundant and repeat it. This is a planned crisis. It is a manufactured catastrophe. It is not the President who is being blackmailed, not the President being pushed into the corner, it is the American people who are being blackmailed by the policies that are going forward in this continuing resolution and the debt ceiling legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are being blackmailed. The children and the students are being blackmailed. There is no concern being shown here about education. Not only is there no compassion for the elderly, there is no compassion for the sick. There is no common sense which says we should continue to invest in education. It is a situation which is very serious.

As I said before, Mr. Speaker, in the days before Republican extremism, education was a unifying force, even more so than defense. It was an issue that brought us together. We should return to that. We should remember Republican Ronald Reagan and his pleas that we are a nation at risk and we need to take some unusual measures to turn that around. We ought to remember the pleas of George Bush when he issued America 2000 and said that he wanted to become the education president. We should remember that President Clinton was at that conference in Virginia where President Bush set

forth the goals, the six goals for American education. We ought to appreciate the fact that President Clinton has continued the basic policies of President Bush.

The Republicans have chosen in this extremist budget to cut the Goals 2000 legislation. Cut the funding for it. One of the backbones of American Federal education assistance is the title I program. The Republican extremists have chosen to cut title I by \$1.1 billion. That is about one-seventh of the total amount. If the American people are out in their local school district or in their city and town and want to figure out what these big numbers mean, take the amount of money that they are receiving for title I programs, of title I funding, and reduce it by one-seventh and they will know what the cut of \$1.1 billion in title I programs for next year, they will know what that means for their particular city and town, for their education unit at the local level.

So, Mr. Speaker, they have made cuts which are reducing the investment in education at a time when we need the investment more than ever before. Good schools are a great investment. They are the kind of investment that Americans had the good sense to make a long time ago and they are still very important.

The philosophy of Rush Limbaugh that if an individual does not make it in American society it means something is wrong with them and nobody should worry about them is a philosophy that needs to be rejected. We should not applaud a Rush Limbaugh who says if a person's mother is sick, they will not go out on the street and beg somebody to help them, so why do they ask the government to help them.

The government is a society. A government is a complex mechanism that has been made over the years, over the centuries, and a lot of people have made contributions to this process of making American civilization what it is. In the Vietnam war, which we still say is important, regardless of what we think of the specifics or the objectives or whether it should have gone on so long, American policy said the Vietnam war was important. American policy went forward to the tune of 57,000 American lives and numerous others who were wounded and in various ways suffered as a result of that war. Forty percent of the bodies that came home from Vietnam were minorities.

Forty percent of the bodies were minorities. Many of them were from these same big cities that we claim are wasting our money because they want more money for health care, they want more money for education. Forty percent.

□ 2130

In all the wars that have ever been fought, who comes out to give the dead soldiers' families millions of dollars? Does Rush Limbaugh deserve to make

millions because of some special endowment from God while the soldiers who died to make the country great do not deserve anything? Does Rush Limbaugh deserve more than the inventors who created radio, television?

Does Rush Limbaugh deserve more than the offspring of some of scientists and researchers who make it possible for us to have the technology which makes cable television and television and all these communication media possible and cheaper? Does Rush Limbaugh deserve more than the person out there who does not have the money to buy a frequency in order to be able to own one of these cable stations?

Is there any American who deserves so much more by right of God than another that our society should show no compassion and no concern for those who cannot make it? Society does owe it to itself to develop the abilities and definitely the capacity of everybody. Make an investment in education. Society should do that.

The illogical rationalization, the excuse that the Republicans keep using that they want to make people suffer now in order to have posterity, not have the burden of a debt, they are so compassionate for posterity, for the unborn, for the people who come in 10, 20 years from now, and yet they show no compassion for those living breathing souls that are here right now. Compassion has to be a concern at all times, as I said before.

When you stop and think about the fact that all that we have discovered in the past few decades about the rest of the universe, about the solar system, about the Moon, we have not gone to Mars, but we have sent exploratory ships that have been able to take samplings of the atmosphere of Mars. With the samplings that have been taken of the gases that exist out there in the universe, we have concluded that nowhere in the universe is there any other human life, there can be no life similar to the life here on Earth.

It is very possible with all of these planets and all the new expansive universe that is being discovered, that there are no other human beings, nothing like a human being. In this whole vast universe there is nothing out there that has a heart, nothing out there that can dream, nothing like human beings that we stop and we think that with all these people in China and all these people who are producing and in underdeveloped countries and all the population explosion in South America that there are too many human beings on the face of the Earth. If you were to stop and think about the universe, there are too few of us.

We ought to look at every human being as being sacred. Everything that breathes, that is human, has a heart and a soul is sacred. Everything that

breathes has a heart and soul is an opportunity for us in terms of if you develop that soul and that heart properly, it will reinvest in the Earth and in our societies on Earth and we will be able to gain from it. Instead, we have no compassion and we have no common sense, so we do not invest in people first.

We have the Rush Limbaughs of the world laughing at programs that seek to help people who need help. The Rush Limbaughs of the world make fun of senior citizens who have to eat dog food. We have the Rush Limbaughs of the world who think slavery is a great joke. That the greatest crime ever created in history is a joke; 232 years of American slavery is funny. We have that kind of prevailing attitude. That jester becomes the counselor and therapist, for great amounts of money, who support a party that has control of the Congress, the House of Representatives, and the Senate. All of this is going on in America. Look with common sense and ask yourself the question, how can we get out of it. Let us start by making an investment in education.

Stop and think about all the kind of cuts that have been made in education. Let me refresh your memory. Overall, the Republican budget cuts in education cut domestic spending. Republican budget cuts cut domestic spending overall by only 4 percent. But when it comes to education, the appropriations bills related to education, they cut the budget by 16 percent, almost \$4 billion to be more exact, 3.9 some billion, but almost \$4 billion is cut in education. When you go onto job training and other programs related to workers, it is 24 percent.

The Republican extremists have declared war on students, on education, and on workers. Workers who were trained in this transition economy to become more productive, workers who drive the great consumer market that makes it possible for us to have prosperity, they are under attack. The greatest cuts are aimed at them. We have increases in the defense budget, we may have increases even in the CIA budget. We have no way of knowing. We certainly do not have the proper cuts in the CIA budget.

As I said before, of these cuts, 1 billion or 17 percent are aimed at title I. Title I is the biggest Federal program for elementary and secondary school assistance. Title I goes to practically 98 percent of the school districts in America. So we are cutting title I, a small portion of the budget, 98 percent of the school districts of America at a time when they need more help than ever before in education. We have eliminated in the same budget the summer youth employment program. The summer youth employment program provides jobs for 600,000 youth across the country. School systems



will tell you it is very important in terms of the work that they do to have those jobs available for their students during the summer.

This House had some alternatives. The Republican majority is not operating in the dark. The Congressional Black Caucus put forward a budget which, like the Republican plan, proposed to eliminate the deficit over 7 years. We did not agree with 7 years. We think that, if you are going to balance the budget, you should take 10 years or longer, but 10 years is reasonable. But we had to do it in 7 years in order to be allowed to bring it, in order to gain access to the floor. We were told you cannot bring a budget unless you balance the budget in 7 years. We did not cut Medicare. We did not cut Medicaid. We increased education by 25 percent, and we still had a balanced budget.

The President has proposed to increase education. Education is one of the few areas that the President proposes to increase the budget at. The President has the support of the business community. The article that appeared in Washington Outlook had a title which said, "Will Republicans Make Clinton the Education President?" This article is about the support that President Clinton is getting from businessmen, from the heads of corporations on this education budget.

They are saying to the President, we would like for the President to forge ahead on Goals 2000. We would like not to turn back the clock on educational reform. We want to continue what Ronald Reagan started. We want to continue what George Bush advanced.

We are all together on this, the corporate executives who make decisions about life and death of America every day in terms of production, in terms of the way we use our resources, they want education to be funded. Many of them are supporting National Education Funding Day on November 18. They understand the good sense of bringing to the attention the fact that education is a top priority. If we cannot read the polls and we do not understand what happened in Virginia, what did Democrats in Virginia do, they made education their primary concern. Identification was no secret. It was a weapon out there on the table, and they ran on an education platform and they pulled a Stalingrad. They showed that the invincible war machine of the Republicans can be defeated. What do these education cuts mean in terms of my home State of New York?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART].

#### WAIVING PROVISIONS OF CLAUSE 4(b) OF RULE XI AGAINST CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-335) on the resolution (H. Res. 265) waiving a requirement of clause 4(b) of rule XI with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed.

(Mr. OBEY asked and was given permission to proceed out of order for 1 minute.)

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I do not know if this would be appropriate the time to ask unanimous consent that I might speak out of order in order to inquire of someone on the other side of the aisle what their plans would be for this evening's schedule?

I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT].

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], I would like to advise all Members that as things currently stand, we hope we will have not any additional votes tonight.

However, I would advise Members that discussions initiated by the Speaker and the majority leader with the President will be going on starting at 10:00 tonight and should those talks yield any agreement that would necessitate action on the House floor, all Members will have 1 hour notice to return to the Capitol.

One other thing I might add is that if the President does veto the CR that has been sent down, we are obliged to pick that up tonight. So I would urge all Members to keep in touch with their respective cloakrooms.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, my understanding is we are obliged to deal with that tonight if the House is in session.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, that is correct.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, if the House has completed its business on special orders and is not in session for special orders, could I ask what the plans would be then and whether under any circumstances Members would have an hour's notice?

Mr. HASTERT. Under all circumstances, we will anticipate that Members have an hour lead time before there will be a vote. We will take special orders and our intention is when special orders are exhausted or finished, we will go into recess and wait for a report from the meeting at the White House. We anticipate that our Members will have the ability to hear what happened at the White House this evening.

Mr. OBEY. Does the gentleman have any idea, is there any point beyond

which you would want the House to adjourn or could we expect that we might be in session through 6:00, 7:00, 8:00 tomorrow morning?

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I would not anticipate being in session at that time. I would think that for the remainder of this evening, at least until midnight, the House would be in session so that if there is movement or results from the discussions tonight that we could act upon it or at least be advised.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, if there is not sufficient movement by, say, midnight or so, is it then the gentleman's understanding that there would be a motion to adjourn?

Mr. HASTERT. I would say that if there is not any information or movement within a reasonable time, I would say that would be probably shortly after midnight that the House would stand adjourned.

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. BARR of Georgia). The gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude by saying, God bless the common sense of the American people. God bless the common sense of the American people as reflected in the current polls. God bless the common sense of the American people as reflected in the elections last week. God bless the common sense of the American people because it has brought us through a lot of manufactured crises as well as real crises. This is a manufactured crisis. We do not need to be as mean and extreme as the Republican majority in this House insists on being. We can go forward and we can begin to go forward by supporting education again as a bipartisan effort. Education should be a priority for both Republicans and Democrats.

God bless the American people. God bless their common sense.

#### A SPECIAL THANK YOU

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] is recognized for 10 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening for a brief period of time to say thank you. Today is my first day back in the session after approximately 3 weeks of recovering, becoming a member of what is known as the zipper club. Never would I have thought that at the age of 48 I would have to undergo open heart surgery, but I did. And I am here to say thank you to a lot of people who made my past 3 weeks very worthwhile and

profitable and who certainly helped me in a period of need.

□ 2145

Let me first of all say, Mr. Speaker, that it was 3 weeks ago last Friday, after I had gone to the House Physician, Dr. John Eisold, who I have the highest respect for, and told him that I thought I had a fullness in my chest and sought some advice from him, that he suggested I go to the Bethesda Naval Hospital even though I reside in Pennsylvania. I took his advice that night after taking a stress test under his supervision and the supervision of Dr. David Ferguson, a Navy officer and physician at the Bethesda, and they realized a very abnormal EKG, and therefore the next day should undergo a catheterization process. I did that, Mr. Speaker, on that Friday morning and by 12 noon was under the surgeon's knife because of the need to conduct a surgery immediately. It turned out that I had 95-percent blockage of my main artery. Doctor Edward Zeck actually performed the surgery, and he also was a Navy physician and someone who I also hold with the highest respect.

Mr. Speaker, here I am 3½ weeks later, able to come to the House floor and carry on the business of representing my constituents, and here I am in full health again, on the road to recovery, in fact 15 pounds lighter, although I would not suggest to any of my colleagues that this be a way that you lose weight.

But the reason I take the floor tonight, Mr. Speaker, is to thank some people; first of all to thank the Navy personnel who day in and day out provide health care for our enlisted personnel. I, as a Member of Congress stuck in Washington, had no place to go, and because of the recommendation of Dr. Eisold, I was referred to Bethesda. I received outstanding treatment, the same type of treatment that the people in the rooms next to me received, all of whom were enlisted personnel. There is nothing that I can say or do to make the case for the support for the medical services of our military personnel because they were just phenomenal.

I also want to thank God, Mr. Speaker, because without his counsel and guidance and without the prayer of many of my constituents and colleagues in this body perhaps I would not have been able to avoid what the surgeons referred to as the widowmaker, the widowmaker being a 95-percent blockage that I had in my main descending artery. I want to thank my colleagues from this body who called, sent letters and cards, and who made their wishes known from both sides of the aisle. It certainly helped in my recovery. I want to thank my staff, my friends.

I want to thank my family, my wife and five children, who put up with my

past 3 weeks at home while watching C-SPAN, day and night, wishing I could be here getting involved in the issues of the day. I also want to thank my constituents who I think understand that I had to take some time off to recover to be able to be back here today to vote on the very important things that are coming before us in this session of Congress.

But, Mr. Speaker, I also rise today, besides thanking many people including the good Navy folks at Bethesda, I rise to encourage my colleagues who sometimes, oftentimes, get caught up in the business of representing their constituents, to make sure they take time to look out for their own health. I did not. I never thought at 48 years old that I would be a prime candidate for open heart surgery. But because of all that fast food, all of those 18-hour days, all of those 7-day-a-week efforts, I did not take time to watch out for myself.

So I come to the floor today to ask my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to take time out to check their own medical condition, to make sure that they take advantage of the medical technology that is out there today to have the kinds of success that I had in avoiding what would have been a catastrophic heart attack if I had not taken preventive efforts 3½ weeks ago.

So, Mr. Speaker, I rise with a heart filled with thanks and a heart that is filled with energy, ready to go and take on the battles, and I take time out from this heavy debate here on the floor to say thank you to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their thoughts, their cards, their prayers, and for being my friends.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINGSTON. Please, would you? If the gentleman would yield to me, I would request that our colleagues speak under unanimous-consent agreement. I would greatly appreciate that because this is our hour, and we would like to make a few discussions. But I would certainly yield for unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. HOYER. Can I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's hour be extended by whatever period of time I take? I do not know whether that is an appropriate unanimous-consent request, but that is the unanimous-consent request I make.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARR of Georgia). I am not sure that would be in order, but certainly the gentleman from Pennsylvania continues to have the floor.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I certainly will accommodate our friend from

Georgia, but let me say, as someone who has worked very, very closely with the gentleman from Pennsylvania for many, many years, he has been the leader in this Congress on the formation, and the growth, and flourishing of the Fire Service Caucus. He has been a leader in foreign affairs, a leader on the Committee on Armed Services, and a leader in so many other efforts on behalf of his constituents and on behalf of this country.

I want him to, however, in this period of time when we are—because he is such an able Member—when we are contending so heartily here, Mr. Speaker, I want him to rest, and I want him to take care of himself, not work those 7 days a week, 20-hour days that he has been working, and I want to say we welcome you back on this side of the aisle.

I have often said that it is unfortunate that people see us on this floor usually contending about the 20 percent of the issues that are contentious and we have disagreements on, and they sometimes, I think, believe that we do not interact with one another as human beings, as colleagues, and as people who care about this country and work together on an overwhelming majority of issues to make our country a better place for our children, our constituents, and all Americans, and so I join with, I know, my other colleagues in welcoming CURT WELDON from Pennsylvania back to the House. We share his joy and the joy of his family that the genius of medical technology has enabled him to come back whole and indeed from those with whom I have talked to have had this operating feeling much better than he did before, and I am confident that he is going to continue to be one of the most able, involved, effective Members in this body.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. I thank my colleague.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROEMER. I just want to welcome you back. I think around here we are not bipartisan enough, and certainly the bipartisanship on the Democratic side extends to this Republican Member, Mr. WELDON from Pennsylvania.

I know a lot of firefighters in the Third District of Indiana were praying for you, for your good health, and we are delighted to see you back, and we miss some of that fiery speech making that you give on the floor as well, too.

So, welcome back.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. I simply would like to welcome the gentleman back also, and I say that his comments remind me of the late Claude Pepper when Claude came back after open heart surgery. I heard him at a senior citizen convention. They gave him a big round of applause, and he said, "I want to thank



you from the bottom of a very repaired heart."

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues.

#### THE IMPORTANCE OF BALANCING THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] is recognized for 50 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I am certainly glad to join the gentlemen in welcoming the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] back. We are glad to have him with us, and Democrats and Republicans during this stressful period of negotiations can certainly agree on that and keep in mind what is the most important thing.

Mr. Speaker, as of November 8, 1995, our national debt was \$4,984,737,460,958.92.

Now that was on the 8th of November. On the 13th, which is today, that figure has risen to \$4,985,913,011,032.65. We advance each week in terms of almost \$3 billion.

Mr. Speaker, this debt is passed on to our children.

Now I have a 7-year-old daughter, and the other day, as I was coming off the floor making my daily phone call home, Ann asked me, "Daddy, what were you voting on?" And it was, as you will recall, Mr. Speaker, last week right after the vote on increasing the debt ceiling was held, and I had just voted to increase the debt ceiling on my 7-year-old, and I think that just having that happen immediately underscored the importance to me of what we are trying to do when we talk about balancing the budget. It is not academic, it is something that my 7-year-old daughter, her 5-year-old brother, her 10-year-old brother, and her 12-year-old sister will be having to pay. A child born today, Mr. Speaker, owes \$187,000 in interest on the national debt during his or her 75-year lifetime, and that does not even pay the principal down.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I think it is so important right now for us to keep in mind why we are working late tonight, why are we working probably through Thanksgiving and maybe through Christmas. But we need to balance the budget for our children's children.

Previous speaker tonight was talking about education and education being an investment. I could not agree with that statement more. But I can tell you another investment, and that is keeping America from going broke, and that is why it is so important for us to support this Republican plan to balance the 7-year budget, because you see, Mr. Speaker, in the year 2002 the Republican balanced budget plan has a

zero deficit, but the President's plan has a \$200 billion deficit in the year 2002. The differences are real.

We have a real bill here. We want to balance the budget. We do not want to close government down. But we have got to do this for our children.

Mr. WELDON from Florida has joined us, and I would like to yield the floor to him. I see he has a chart and also the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LAHOOD].

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I cannot agree with you more on the importance of balancing our budget for the sake of our children and for our children's children.

The United States has a longstanding history of doing what is right in the setting of adversity, in difficult times coming to the right conclusions, and I believe that today our Nation is really at that point. I think when the other body failed to ratify the balanced budget amendment and our dollar decreased from about 106 yen to about 80 yen, I think that gave the American people a good glimpse of what happens to a nation that truly does spend more than it takes in. Its currency is ultimately worth nothing, and the implications for that on our entire economic system is really huge, and I cannot understand why the President will not join us in this historic effort to restore fiscal sanity to our budgeting process and to make sure that our children are not left bankrupt, but do inherit a brighter and better future, and I do want to take a minute to talk a little bit about this chart because the President has been talking about saving Medicare, and I personally think it is disgraceful for him to be carrying on like this because everybody knows that in his health care plan that he was talking about back in 1993, he was talking about taking billions of dollars out of the Medicare plan. Now he is saying that he wants to prevent or stop some of the changes we want to make in the Medicare plan, but what he is engaging in I think is deceptive because, if you look at what we are doing right now with the Medicare plan, the seniors currently pick up about 31.5 percent of the premium. That is about \$42 a month.

Now this is the part B. The part A is the hospital insurance fund, and that comes out of people's Federal withholding as a separate tax. This is the part B plan. This covers physician services as well as certain outpatient services, and currently today the average senior spends about \$42 a month for that, and that actually only consists of about 31.5 percent of premium. The actual total cost per month is about \$130.

Now this was originally a 50-50 split back in 1964 when the program was created, and in an effort to help seniors cope with limited budgets that has been allowed to go down to 31.5 per-

cent, and what we do in our plan is we fix it at that level.

□ 2200

What the President wants to do is let that share, the part seniors pick up, shrink down to 25 percent. But what he does not talk about is who is going to pick up the rest of this. This gets right back to what the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] was talking about. We do not have this. He wants to go out and borrow this money from our children to pay for this difference. We want to keep this right at this level here.

The most shameful thing in all this is that he only wants to do this for 1 year, for 1 year, so that he can get the votes of senior citizens, and then beginning in 1997 and 1998 and 1999 and 2000 and 2001 and 2002, he wants to let the senior citizens, premiums go up on part B so that in the end, in the Clinton proposal, they will be paying \$83 a month and in the Republican proposal they will be spending \$90 a month.

Why is he doing this? Why is he doing this right now? He is doing this because he wants their votes. He said to the American people back in 1992 that he would give them a middle-class tax cut. In 1993 he changed his mind. He said he was going to change welfare as we know it. Then he never did that. He said he was going to put forward a 5-year balanced budget proposal, and he never did. I personally think what he is doing here is playing politics with the votes of senior citizens.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINGSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LAHOOD. Let me just also indicate something else that I think is going on. There has been a campaign throughout the country on behalf of the Democrats to try and scare senior citizens into believing that Republicans want to throw senior citizens off of Medicare, that we want to eliminate Medicare, that we want to do something drastic to Medicare, when the truth of the matter is that three of the President's own Cabinet members have told us that if we do not do something to reform, to preserve, to protect the Medicare Program, it will be broke.

Yet our friends on the other side of the aisle would have you believe that we can keep continuing doing what we have been doing, but the point is there are a number of people coming into the system, health care costs are going up, and we want to try and strengthen and preserve the program. We do not want to throw senior citizens off. We do not want to reduce the benefit. We want to preserve and protect the program.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINGSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank my friend, the gentleman from Illinois. He makes

a very valid point. Indeed, as my other colleagues have gone out to do town halls in their districts, also perhaps via mail, asking through questionnaires what is going on, I think the gentleman from Illinois makes a point that cannot be stated enough. A bipartisan group, including three of President Clinton's own Cabinet officers, say we have to fix this because if we do nothing, the program goes broke.

The other thing we need to state, because somehow, through the midst of deliberate disinformation and an advertising campaign, one simple fact has also been ignored. We need to state it ad nauseum. That is this: that under our plan for Medicare plus, average expenditures per beneficiaries increase from \$4,800 this year to \$6,700 in the year 2002. No doubt earlier in this special order that fact has been brought up, but I daresay it is something that needs to be repeated again and again and again. And, indeed, we hear from people in our districts, we hear from people in our States tonight via the telefax, just before I walked in on the floor, the Epsteins from Arizona, a pair of self-described seasoned citizens, to use the expression of one of our friends from radio fame, write me and say this: "Stay the course. Stick with present budget. We support the efforts of the 104th Congress. Good luck. Keep the faith."

Ms. Nelson from Clarksdale, AZ, called in tonight with a three-word message: "Don't back down."

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I think this. I think when people are presented with the facts, not a 30-second commercial, because if you tell people a lie often enough, they will believe it, so when people are not told the facts they begin to believe that that is the truth. But when people are presented with the facts, which you have just presented, that we want to preserve and protect, and that their benefit is not going to be cut, it is not going to be decreased, they begin to get the correct information and begin to know that we are trying to strengthen, to preserve, to protect a program that has worked well.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, one thing to keep in mind is that under the 7-year balanced budget plan, we are increasing overall spending by \$3 trillion instead of \$4 trillion. Four trillion dollars would keep us on the road to bankruptcy, but we are increasing it \$3 trillion, and in the same time, during the same period of time, balancing the budget; Medicare spending, as you know, goes from \$178 billion to \$286 billion.

Let me repeat, and I see the gentleman from Kentucky wants to make a point on this, we are going from \$178 billion to \$286 billion during that 7-year time. That is an increase in Medicare, even if you have a Democrat deficit disorder.

Mr. JONES. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I would like to ask

the gentleman, what is so extreme about saving Medicare, balancing the budget, reforming welfare, giving tax breaks to families with children? What is so extreme? We keep hearing the word "extreme" today, used on us, that we are trying to do extreme things.

If we are extreme, then they are saying that the American people are extreme. The President keeps saying "extreme." I do not see anything extreme in what we are doing. We are doing exactly what the American people have asked us to do.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I would like to comment on that, I remember when I was a kid growing up, somebody once called me a name. I do not know if they called me a liar or whatever. I went to my daddy and I was upset, and I said, why are they doing that? And he said something to me that I will never forget. He said, "A lot of times when people call you names, they have a problem in that area themselves, and they are externalizing it on you, but they really, actually have the problem."

I want to show you some numbers that I think convinces me how extreme the situation is here with our colleagues on the left side of the aisle and with the White House. Bill Clinton said he was going to balance the budget in 5 years, back in 1992. He did not present a balanced budget in 1993 after he was elected, he did not present it in 1994, he did not present it in 1995. Then after we put our budget on the table, he finally brought forth his 10-year budget.

When he stood over here and said that he would put forward a budget using the CBO numbers, he did not do that. His numbers that he ultimately presented to us, after he was shamed into having to produce something, his 10-year budget was based on his budget office, so we had the CBO look at his numbers. Look at this. It goes from \$196 billion to \$209 billion at the end of 10 years. There is absolutely no attempt to balance the books here. I would not call this extreme, personally, I would call this irresponsible.

Mr. HAYWORTH. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I think we go to that word "extreme" and use it in a couple of different directions. I think, with reference to what my good friend, the gentleman from Florida, just outlines, especially in the wake of the curious behavior of this Nation's Chief Executive, who says one thing one day and something else the next day, I think we have to say, "This is extremely confusing." And with reference to extremism being used with our plans, extremism, I think we can simply say that what we have talked about, saving, protecting, my good friend, and defending Medicare through Medicare plus, genuine welfare reform, tax cuts for the middle class, and a glide path to a balanced budget in 7

years, I think we have to describe that as being extremely, extremely commonsensical.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield further, I want to make a point here for the people that happen to be watching our discussion. For those people who do not know it, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON] is a doctor. He is a freshman Member of the 104th Congress. I guess, what, he was a family practitioner, is that correct?

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Sort of. I was an internist. A family practitioner for senior citizens.

Mr. LAHOOD. And I assume you probably had as your patients senior citizens.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. About half my practice.

Mr. LAHOOD. Now, would anybody believe that Dr. DAVE WELDON, the gentleman from Florida, now a Member of the 104th Congress, would want to throw any of his patients off of Medicare, would want them to be deprived of medical care? Of course they would not. And for someone like the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON], now a Congressman, to be accused by people on the other side of the aisle of being hard-hearted or wanting to throw people off of Medicare is just simply nonsense.

I just want the American people to know that the gentleman from Florida, Dr. WELDON, comes here as a practitioner of medicine for senior citizens. Who could care more about the seniors of our country than one who has practiced medicine for senior citizens? I think it is an important point.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINGSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CHABOT. Getting back to what the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH] said, what is extreme. I think what is really extreme would be to go along with what the President has been posturing to do. That is, to continue to bankrupt this Nation by not balancing the budget. That was the message that I heard, and I have been hearing all year, is it is time finally to balance the budget.

I have parents. My parents are in their seventies. They are both on Medicare. They both receive Social Security. We are trying to save Medicare for the elderly folks in this country so it is there when we are going to be using it. I also have little kids. I have a daughter that is 13, I have a son that is 6 years old. What has been happening in this country over the past couple of decades, however, is huge debt has been built up and spent, and we are turning it over to these kids and saying, "You are going to pay this debt, because we have not been able to do it. We have not had a Congress that has had the guts to balance the budget."



We have one now. We have got a Congress that is saying, "We are no longer going to spend this Nation into bankruptcy." I hope and I pray that the President of the United States will work with us, so we can cut out all this posturing and balance the budget, cut taxes, and do the things which we promised to do. I think the American people, as they learn what the overall plan is, will be supportive. I am from Cincinnati, and the calls that I got today were 7 to 1 saying, "Stick to your guns, don't back down, don't back down to the President; balance the budget." That is what I, for one, intend to do.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I got the same type of phone calls today. I just want to go back to this extremism that is coming from the President and the liberals.

If you want to talk about extremism, I have a daughter that is 13 also, I would say to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CHABOT]. If you project out, if nothing is done to balance our budget to get this spending under control, in the year 2030 my daughter, midway through her life and through her career, will have hanging over her head not—you know, today we have approximately a \$5 trillion debt. That is the debt. But in the year 2030, let us look at this extreme number, the deficit spending for 1 year, just 1 year, will be \$4 trillion. That is mind-boggling. We cannot continue, we cannot go on and survive as a Nation with that kind of spending.

Mr. CHABOT. If the gentleman will continue to yield, just following up on the point about what a balanced budget means, it means real things to real American citizens, if we can finally balance the budget.

For example, a person who buys a home, say they spend \$75,000 for a home, and there is a 30-year loan for that home. If we can balance the budget, interest rates are estimated to go down by about 2 percent. So for that family who buys that home over the time that they pay for that home, they would save \$37,000 over the life of that loan if we can just balance the budget. It will be money in people's pockets so the economy can thrive, and we will have people working rather than being on unemployment or being on welfare. There will be a lot of benefits. It will mean good things for American citizens if we can balance this budget.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman would yield, I am wondering, since you are from Cincinnati, there was a cartoon in one of the Cincinnati papers which showed a man and woman sitting around the kitchen tables paying their bills. They had a calculator and a big stack of envelopes going out to the companies that they owed money to, and the woman turns to her husband and says, "Honey, I think we need to increase our debt ceiling."

What that shows is that this is real. This means something to your daughter in Kentucky, and your family back in Ohio with that 30-year mortgage. This is real money that we are talking about.

I was very disappointed last week, four of you folks are freshmen, the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. LEWIS, and I were here last year. But it was a shock to all of us when the President actually went golfing. The House passed a debt ceiling increase and continuing resolution to try to balance the budget, and the President held a press conference saying that he was going to veto it and then goes to play golf, the rich man's sport.

While the Federal employees in 1 hour and 45 minutes will be furloughed, their President who claims to be their champion left to play golf. I hope it was a good round. I do not play. I do not know how to play. I have never been a member of the country club like the President. But a lot of Federal workers in my area do not play golf. And tomorrow when they wake up and do not have a job, they are not going to be playing golf. The President was playing golf.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank my friend from Georgia and I think he brings up several good points in terms of the behavior of the gentleman who sits at the other end of Pennsylvania Ave.

It has been curious throughout his term, and indeed the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] in a radio response to the gentleman from the other end of Pennsylvania Ave., once speculated that perhaps we ought to constitutionally set up a new office and call it "Campaigner in Chief," so that the gentleman at the other end of Pennsylvania Ave. can go around and make the speeches and get people to like him, to really like him. In the meantime, we ought to find a genuine Chief Executive who is willing to join with us and govern.

It is not my intent to pour salt in the wounds rhetorically, but it is very curious that much of what candidate Clinton spoke of in 1992, much of what the good doctor repeated here tonight, is included in what we have sent to him that he chose to veto.

There comes a time when regardless of party label, we are called upon to join together and govern. And if we are to be candid, while there are those firm in their resolve who have called me tonight, there are others who have contacted me. My wife gave me the number of a family in Scottsdale, AR. A little boy doing a school project needed our address, so I called him. He was surprised to hear from his Congressman.

His dad got on the phone and said, "Congressman, I am really worried about the Government shutting down tomorrow." And I said, "Sir, I share your concern. We in this Chamber did

what we could, what is within our rights to do, and the President chose not to go along with it." The reason we did it was not to box anyone into a corner, but for the very reasons that my good friend, the gentleman from Kentucky, and my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio mentioned, and that is as genuine as our concern is for the seniors of this country, we also have great concern for our children and generations yet unborn.

The fact is, my little boy, John Micah, who will turn 2 December 2, has hanging over his head if we do not make changes, if we maintain the status quo with the legislative equivalent of chewing gum and baling wire, if we continue to try and keep things going as they are, John Micah over the course of his lifetime will pay over \$185,000 just on the debt. Just to service the debt. That is unconscionable. We cannot do that to our children. That is why we are making the tough decisions we have to make to change what is going on.

If it takes this action, as regrettable as this action may be, far better to take this action to change the course of what has gone on, to change the thinking within this Chamber, yes, within this beltway, yes, but to change the thinking to correspond with what we are hearing from the great heartland of America.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida, my good friend.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, that was very, very eloquently said. I just want to harken back to this chart, because this is the balanced budget of the man who plays golf when the House and the Senate were trying to do the Nation's business.

We sent a continuing resolution to him and we sent a debt ceiling increase to him that had some responsible features in it, and he went off and played golf. I personally thought that that said volumes about his commitment to these principles.

Mr. HAYWORTH. There is one other example that I think we should bring up in the wake of that horrible, horrible assassination in Israel. During the course of the state funeral when representatives from both parties joined the President to fly to Israel, and granted it was a difficult time emotionally for the President, we understand that. But during the course of time spent in the air that exceeded 24 hours, I think something like 26 hours, to hear from our leadership in this House that their interaction with our Chief Executive consisted of a "Thank you" and a hand wave, and that was the extent of the interaction, I have to question this.

Why is it that the Chief Executive is happy to keep Air Force One on a runway at LAX and pay \$200 for a haircut and take the time to do that as he did a couple of years ago, and then not

talk to the leadership of these two bodies to solve the problems we face.

There comes a time when we have to have responsible leadership, and it absolutely astounds me. I know, colleagues, when we raised our hands and took the oath of office we do so to govern with the consent of the governed. We were elected, and so too was that gentleman at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue.

Again this evening, Mr. Speaker, and colleagues, to those watching tonight, we extend the hand. Mr. President, join with us and govern. The American people deserve no less.

It is astounding behavior and it is quizzical to say the least. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON].

Mr. WELDON of Florida. The gentleman from Arizona raises a whole host of points and it harkens back to what I talked about earlier. The President campaigned in 1992 saying that he was going to put forth a balanced budget and balance the budget in 5 years. He put forward nothing in 1993, nothing in 1994, nothing in 1995. And finally, after we put our budget, he came out with this belated, ridiculous attempt to balance the budget, which has red numbers straight through the end of the 10 years. Hence, it would still be \$209 billion.

He said he would change welfare as we know it. He never did. He said he would give the middle class a tax break. He never did. I think we have a real credibility problem here. I have some very, very serious concerns about whether he will ever seriously agree that we need to build a better future for our children, for the young son of the gentleman from Arizona, and my 9-year-old daughter, for the daughter of the gentleman from Ohio, and the daughter of the gentleman from Kentucky, and for the millions and millions of children out there.

Mr. Speaker, what is disgraceful is to play politics with all of this and try to buy votes by telling one group, "We will give you a slightly better deal" and then to turn around and raise their interest rates or raise their premiums or raise their taxes down the road, after he has gotten elected.

Mr. Speaker, this is not leadership. As far as I am concerned, this is playing politics with the very future of our Nation, the future for our children and our grandchildren, and this is not what made America great.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Florida makes some very good points. Candidate Clinton was very different, unfortunately, from President Clinton.

As the gentleman implied, candidate Clinton had said that he was going to end welfare as we know it. I agreed. I remember the commercial like it was on yesterday when he said that, and he

made some very good points. I agreed with everything he said. We do need to change welfare, and that is something we are doing in our balanced budget this year. We really are changing welfare as we know it.

Mr. Speaker, welfare has become, rather than temporary help for the truly needy, far too often a permanent way of life. It has been counterproductive. It has unfortunately hurt children all over this country.

Candidate Clinton also said that he was going to give us a middle-class tax cut. I agreed with him completely that we needed to do that. Unfortunately, President Clinton gave us one of the largest tax increases in our history.

What we did, this new Congress this year, we really did give the middle class a tax cut. Seventy-five percent of the tax cuts go to people who make less than \$75,000.

Mr. Speaker, I hear over and over here in this particular body from some of the folks on the other side of the aisle here that we are cutting Medicare, which we are not because we are increasing Medicare, to give tax cuts, supposedly, to the rich. When, in fact, as I said, the tax cuts predominately go to the middle class of this Nation where they should go.

One final point I would like to make about something the President said during the campaign is he indicated he was going to be tough on the death penalty, tough on crime. In this bill that the President has just vetoed which increased the debt ceiling, there was also habeas corpus reform. What that means, basically, is the death penalty in this country, of which I am a strong believer.

Eighty percent of the people in this country believe in the death penalty. But after conviction, we allow it to drag on. People are on death row for 15, 16, 20 years. We finally have legislation which reforms the death penalty in this country and cuts down the amount of time between the imposition of the sentence and actually carrying out the sentence. That was in the bill. The President said he was for it. Unfortunately, he vetoed that as well.

Mr. Speaker, I believe very strongly that we were sent here for a reason. I believe we should try to work with the President, and I wish he would work with us for the betterment of all the people in this country.

Again, as the gentleman from Arizona said, I think we should reach out to the President, just as the Speaker NEWT GINGRICH, and the majority leader, BOB DOLE as we speak here now are apparently meeting at the White House with the President. I hope some good comes from that.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my colleagues, maybe can they answer this: What really have the President and the liberals offered in the 104th Congress,

other than name calling? What have they offered?

Have they offered welfare reform? Have they offered tax breaks for the middle class? Have they offered to save Medicare? Have they offered to balance the budget? What have they offered?

Yes, the President gave us a bogus balanced budget that will not reach balance by the year 2002. In fact it would be \$209 billion in deficit spending. What have they done?

They have had the Congress for 40 years and we are \$5 trillion in debt. In 1965, the Great Society was started to win the war on poverty. We have more people in poverty today than when it started. We have more teenage pregnancy. We have more crime. We have more illiteracy. I mean, what have they done in 40 years and what have they offered this year?

Mr. HAYWORTH. If the gentleman would yield, I think in fairness we do need to point out one thing that the liberals offered and it came very late, indeed, in the last nanosecond of the 11th hour as we stood on this floor and talked about the compelling need for Medicare reform and cited the report. And I would ask the gentleman from Florida if he could get the poster and hold it up again.

We cited what three of President Clinton's own Cabinet officers signed off on in April. "The present financing schedule for the program, the Medicare program, is sufficient to ensure the payment of benefits only over the next 7 years."

When we saw that, and chose in the wake of that report last spring to move to protect and preserve and defend Medicare, our friends on the other side, the liberals, stepped forward with a Band-Aid. They said, OK, we will do a little tinkering around the edges.

Indeed, in the words of one wire service dispatch, in the words of one political observer, in his opinion it amounted to a "deathbed conversion." At the last nanosecond, they stepped forward with a Band-Aid.

Mr. Speaker, I will just make one point and then I will be happy to yield to my friend from Georgia. I heard earlier in this hour the gentleman from Pennsylvania stand in the well and talk about the surgery he needed to return to this Chamber with vitality. It was not easy surgery. He stayed the course and got the medical work done.

Mr. Speaker, I daresay our friend from Pennsylvania and his example serves as a metaphor for what we face with these programs. It takes surgery, not a Band-Aid, to solve the problem. But that is the only thing that has come from the liberal establishment. And as we move past a Great Society, let us go to a better society.

Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Georgia, my friend.

□ 2230

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, on this last-minute PR solution, more than



anything, it was just to say we are in it, too. It calls for a commission to study Medicare. Here we have a group of professional trustees who study Medicare and they have said it is going broke. So what did the other party want to do? They wanted to study it even more.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I think the cleverest part of the argument that is made over here about this statement is that we have had those reports in the past. So we have had them in the past, and we do not want to do anything with it. Some of us came here with the idea that when you get a report like that and that there are people in the country who have benefited from these programs, and nobody will deny that Medicare has been a good program, we feel a responsibility to try and reform the program to preserve it, to protect it for the senior citizens, not simply to say, as our friends on the other side of the aisle would say, oh, we have heard those reports before. Some of us feel a responsibility to do something about it when you get a report from three Cabinet members from the President's own Cabinet.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, let me ask the freshmen, can you imagine coming to a body where they are saying something is going broke and you are supposed to waive it and you are saying, they always say it is going broke. We just have to get through the next 2 years. That is my concern. Would any of you be able to go home and run on that platform that you saw that report and ignored it?

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Absolutely not. That is a very good question. It leads to an important issue on the Medicare Program. The tax on working people to keep the Medicare Program solvent has been raised 23 times since the program was initiated.

Let me just say that, as the gentleman from Illinois mentioned earlier, I am a practicing physician. I still see patients occasionally. The Medicare Program has been a great program. It provides the resources so that our seniors can get good quality medical care in their senior years. I think it is one of the primary things contributing to the dramatic increase in life expectancy for seniors.

When I was in medical school, when I was in college, the average life expectancy for a male, I think, was about 70 or 71. Just in the past 15 years or so it has gone up to about 78. That dramatic improvement, I think, is directly attributable to the good quality medical care that our seniors get. But there have been problems with keeping the program properly funded as there is a problem right now, as this chart next to me indicates, three Clinton Cabinet officials testifying to the fact that there are problems in keeping the program properly funded.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, let me just cite a couple of examples. When-

ever I have been in a room of senior citizens, I say, have any of you had a problem with billing or with some kind of complication with Medicare? Every hand in the room goes up.

A woman from Tremont, IL, came up to me at the Tremont Turkey Festival. She gave me a check. She said: "Congressman, I am 80 years old. Medicare has been a good program. I just received this check from Medicare for 2 cents. How much does it cost to process a check for 2 cents?"

A gentleman came to me at a meeting in Pekin, IL, at a town meeting that I had. He said: "I had a procedure done, I am on Medicare, I had a procedure done. I got a bill from the anesthesiologist for \$8,000. I took it back to him and I said: Could this be right? He said: 'No, it should have been \$800.' But Medicare paid \$8,000."

One other example: A gentleman came to my office in Jacksonville, IL. He received a bill from the hospital 40 days after he had been in there. The first item, intensive care, \$36,000; he said: "I was never in intensive care." Another item down below: Other services, \$11,000. He says: "I do not know what those were."

Are there problems with the Medicare Program? Are there things that need to be fixed? Of course there are. Ask anybody who is receiving Medicare and they will tell you that. That is what we are trying to do, play the responsible role and fix a good program and reform it to save money for people who will want to use the program currently and in the future.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I carry around here in my wallet an article that I clipped out of the newspaper. We verified this article. It is accurate. It is going to take me just a few seconds to read this. It is about Medicare, one of the problems with it.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, we are going to have about 7 minutes left. After the gentleman reads that, I would like everyone to sort of wrap up:

Mr. CHABOT. "Representative JOE KNOLLENBERG"—and we all know JOE here—"Michigan Republican, tells the story of a Michigan woman named Jean English, who while going through the mail of her recently deceased brother found a bill for his last hospital stay. Her brother, who suffered a terminal illness, died only a few days after being admitted.

"The bill for the four-day period came to \$368,511.09. All of it had been forwarded to Medicare for payment. Shocked by the expense, Mrs. English called the hospital for an explanation. What she got was a 14-page itemized statement.

"The greatest expense? A 7-hour stay in the emergency room, according to the bill, required \$347,982.01 worth of supplies."

Just think of that, just 7 hours, \$347,000 worth of supplies.

"Well, after much hemming and hawing," says the Congressman, "the hospital admitted that it had made a mistake. Oops. Instead of \$347,982.01, the actual charge should have been \$61.30. That is right, \$61.30. An overcharge of \$347,920.71."

The problem was found. End of story? No. The errant bill had been sent to Medicare and paid by Medicare. That is right, they had paid the bill.

That is just the tip of the iceberg. We have to find waste where it exists and stop that waste from happening but we do not have to cut anybody's Medicare at all. We want to save it so it is there for the seniors nowadays and for future generations.

Mr. LAHOOD. That is what we call waste, fraud, and abuse. That is an area that anybody that has been involved with Medicare, any senior citizen will tell you, there are all kinds of problems that people face. Some of us feel a responsibility to reform this program, to weed out, to ferret out the waste, fraud, and abuse and save the taxpayers millions and billions of dollars because we want to preserve the program. In order to do that we have to make these kinds of reforms that we are talking about.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I think some very valid points have been raised. Once again our friend from Ohio offers graphic evidence, anecdotal evidence of what can go wrong. My friend from Illinois made a very valid point, reaffirmed to me by the senior citizens of the Sixth District of Arizona. Waste, fraud and abuse is a shocking part of this problem. It is one element of the problem in dealing with health care coverage for seniors.

But, again, what we have to point out, and in my couple of moments here before we wrap up, I want to point out a couple of things. First of all, what we are doing with Medicare is improving and protecting and preserving the system, taking the average beneficiaries, cash award of \$4,800 this year, increasing it to \$6,700 by the year 2002. Also, what we are doing are expanding the choices, giving people more choices, not forcing anyone into the program. But if people like the current system, they are certainly welcome to keep this system.

The sad thing is that younger people have no choice. As I mentioned earlier, my young son, if we change nothing will pay over \$185,000 in taxes just on interest on the debt during the course of his lifetime. To the President's credit he did something called general rational accounting in his last budget where he projected the services for the next generation of Americans if we do not change anything, if we do not right size this Government. And taxpayers of the future, the average taxpayer would

have to surrender 82 percent of his income in taxes to the Federal Government. We have seen it rise exponentially, from 3 percent of the average family of four's income in 1948 to almost one-quarter of the average family's income in 1994. We have to change that not to build a great society but to build an even better society.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, just as Mr. HAYWORTH said, we have to do something and we have to do it now. My mother and father are both 78 years old. My daughter is 13. I have a son that is 24 years old. We have to save Medicare for my mother and my father. We have to balance the budget for my daughter and my son. We have to provide for the future. We have to save the economic viability of this country. And that is what we are all about.

It is beyond politics. We are serious. We want to save a country that is going to be a country that is going to provide the best living opportunities for our children and for our senior citizens. I think we can do no less. The time has come. We have a window of opportunity to do it now. And if we do not do it now, I am afraid it is going to be too late. So I think we have to stop the political rhetoric that is coming from the White House and from the other side. And we have to get serious and do something. I think we face a crisis as great as any crisis we have ever faced in this country and now as I said is the time to do it before it is too late.

I want a future for my mother and my father where they can have a good medical care. I want a future for my daughter and my son where they will not have to spend \$187,000 just on the interest on the debt, where they will not have a tax rate of 82 percent. I want a nation that is going to be strong and the greatest Nation to continue to be the greatest Nation on the face of this Earth.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON].

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia is very gracious. I guess I would like to wrap up by pointing out that President Bill Clinton ran in 1992 as the candidate for change and his behavior over the past 2 or 3 days, I think, clearly indicates that though he ran as a candidate for change he is the President of the status quo. The status quo is not going to get us into the next century for a brighter, better and more prosperous future for ourselves and for our children.

He ran saying that he was going to balance the budget and never presented to us a balanced budget proposal. He ran saying that he was going to end welfare as we know it, and he never presented a plan to be able to do that. And he also ran saying that he was going to give us a middle-class tax cut,

and what he gave us was a tax increase. And furthermore, for him to do absolutely nothing in the area of preserving and protecting Medicare and making sure that it will be there for our seniors because, Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, we will agree if the Nation is bankrupt, nobody will get good quality medical care, including our seniors.

And we have put forward these proposals to the President who keeps vetoing them and vetoing them. I personally think this is morally wrong for him to do that. He should be willing to sit down and negotiate with us and try to come to terms, but he is not doing that. And he really is playing politics with these issues, particularly in the area of Medicare.

We have put forward a reasonably balanced Medicare proposal and he is playing politics with the issue.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, let us just close with this, do we, members of the Republican freshman class, the sophomore class of the Republicans, do we want to shut down Government? Do we want Federal employees to be out of work tomorrow morning? Do we want the Republican Party to ruin this negotiation? Do we want one side to blink first?

The answer to all of that is no. What we want is a balanced budget. What we want is Medicaid restructured. What we want is welfare reform. What we want is tax relief for the middle class. And above all we want to save, protect and preserve Medicare.

We believe that there is plenty of room for a bipartisan agreement. Democrats and Republicans can come together for the children and the future of America. We are proud to participate in that process.

We hold our hands open for our Democrat colleagues who want to join us and we hope and pray that the President of the United States will work with the leaders of House and Senate to do what is best, not for either party, not for reelection, but for the American public.

I thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LAHOOD], for being with me, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CHABOT], the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH], a night-time regular, and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LEWIS], for this special order.

□ 2245

#### THE MOST IMPORTANT PROBLEMS FACING OUR COUNTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] is recognized for 50 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, while we await an understanding of the meet-

ing taking place in the White House now between the President and the Republican leadership, let me review for my fellow Vermonters and for people throughout this country what I consider to be some of the most important problems facing this country, talk a little bit about some solutions that I think make sense to many millions of Americans, and then talk about how the Contract With America impacts all of that.

The first point that I want to make, Mr. Speaker, is that some of the most important issues facing our country are, unfortunately, not talked about terribly often. They are not talked about by our Republican friends, they are not talked about by our Democratic friends, they are not talked about by the corporate media, and I think one of the reasons that we have a great deal of anxiety in this country is that people are hurting, they are in pain, they know that something is wrong, but they turn on the television, they read the papers, and they do not see that the realities of their life are being discussed, and I think that further alienates them from the political process, it confuses them, it gets them angry.

Let us talk about a few of the realities that are not widely discussed on the floor of this House, or on the television, or the radio:

No. 1, if you were to ask me what the most important reality facing America is, the reality is that for the vast majority of our people, some 80 percent of the American people, they are becoming poorer. People in America today, in large numbers, are working longer hours for lower wages. Since 1973, 80 percent of Americans have seen either a decline in their real wages or, at best, economic stagnation.

So that is the first reality that I think we have to talk about. When we turn on the television, or we look in the newspapers, and they tell us that new jobs are being created, the gross national product is growing, the economy is booming; what we have to say is all of those statistics are not terribly relevant to what is going on in the lives of real working people.

Mr. Speaker, real people today, working people today, are working longer hours, they are earning lower wages, and more and more of the jobs that are being created are part-time jobs, are temporary jobs, are jobs without good benefits. So that is the most important reality, and frankly, instead of discussing a whole lot of other issues that we spend huge amounts of time on in this Chamber, that should be the paramount issue:

Why is it that for the vast majority of our people our standard of living is in decline? Why is it that for family farmers in the State of Vermont they are receiving 50 percent of the income they received 15 years ago and are



being forced to leave the land? And that problem exists not only for family farmers all over America, but for working people all over this country. That is the first reality that I want to touch upon tonight, and that needs a whole lot of discussion on the floor of the House.

The second issue is that while it is true that for 80 percent of our people they are experiencing a decline in their standard of living, there is another reality that is taking place which we hardly ever talk about, and that is we do not congratulate Michael Eisner, who is the president of the Walt Disney Corp. for the hundred million dollars he earned several years ago. We do not give enough congratulations to Bill Gates, the major stockholder of Microsoft who is now worth \$9 billion. We do not talk too much about the fact that the major CEO's in this country now earn over \$3 million a year on average. In essence what we are not talking about is that while 80 percent of our people are seeing a decline in their standard of living or, at best, economic stagnation, the people on the top today are doing better than perhaps at any time in the modern history of the United States.

In the last 20 years, Mr. Speaker, the wealthiest 1 percent of American families saw their after-tax incomes more than double. The wealthiest 1 percent of American now owns a greater percentage of the Nation's wealth than at any time since the 1920's. So, yes, there are two realities that are taking place. On the one hand, the average American is seeing a decline in his or her standards of living. Women, who would prefer to stay home taking care of the kids, are now forced to go into the work force. The new jobs that are being created by our kids are often part-time jobs or minimum-wage jobs.

That is the reality that impacts on the vast majority of the American people, but the other reality that we do not talk about too often, we are kind of quiet about it, is that for the rich and the powerful, hey what is the problem? Things have never been better. Today the wealthiest 1 percent of the population owns more wealth than the bottom 90 percent. We do not talk about that too much. We do not talk about concepts like social justice in America. We do not talk about the fact that there has been an enormous growth in millionaires and billionaires while at the same time this country, the United States, has the highest rate of childhood poverty in the industrialized world by far. Twenty-two percent of the kids live in poverty, yet we are having a huge growth in millionaires and billionaires. Where is the justice? Why are we not talking about that issue?

Mr. Speaker, the other thing that we do not talk about too often is to put our situation in a broader context in

terms of what is happening in the whole world. There is no question but that much of the industrialized world is suffering economic problems just as we are. But it should be pointed out that whereas in the early 1970's the working people of the United States had the highest standard of living in the world, they earned the highest wages, they had the best benefits; today, according to various studies, we rank 13th in the world behind many European countries and behind some of the Scandinavian countries.

Recently, Mr. Speaker, you have read in the paper how BMW and other European companies are coming to the United States to start factories, often in the South but in other parts of America. Why are European companies coming to the United States? And the answer is an answer that many people my age would have not believed possible if we had discussed this issue 20 or 30 years ago. They are coming to America for cheap labor because in Europe, in Germany, in France and Scandinavia you cannot find workers who are going to work for \$8 an hour or \$10 an hour. Those workers make significantly more than American workers, and European companies are coming to America for the same reason that American companies go to Mexico or American companies go to China, in search of cheap labor. That is an issue that we should be discussing in this House of Representatives: how does it happen that American workers are now a source of cheap labor for European companies?

Mr. Speaker, as bad as the situation is now for most middle-age workers, the situation is even more frightening for our young workers, and I think one of the reasons there is so much anxiety in this country is not only that middle-age people are nervous about what is going to happen to their lives, what is going to happen to their parents, they are worried about what is going to happen to their kids.

Mr. Speaker, in the last 15 years the wages for entry-level jobs for young men who are high school graduates has declined by 30 percent. That means the young men who are getting out of high school now are earning 30 percent less than was the case 15 years ago for high school graduates. Fifteen years ago when somebody graduated high school, they most certainly were not wealthy, they did not get a great job, but often there were jobs in a town in a factory that paid a worker a living wage. Today many of those jobs are gone, and the jobs that are available for our young men and our young women are flipping hamburgers at McDonald's and working at other service-industry jobs. Thirty percent decline in wages for high school graduates were men, and 18-percent decline for young women.

Mr. Speaker, the sad reality is that Americans at the lower end of the wage

scale, our low-income workers, are now, if you can believe it, the lowest-paid workers in the entire industrialized world. Eighteen percent of American workers with full-time jobs, full-time jobs, are paid so little that their wages do not enable them to live above the poverty level. That is what is going on in America. That is what happens when you make \$4.50 an hour or you make \$5.50 an hour. But this economic decline does not only impact high school graduates, it is also impacting those people who have been able to go through college.

Between 1987 and 1991, the real wages of college-educated workers declined by over 3 percent. That is college-educated workers. Over one-third of recent college graduates have been forced to take jobs not requiring a college degree, and that is twice as many as was the case 5 years ago. What a sad state of affairs when many people such as myself say, "Well, education is the key. We have got to make sure our people go to college." That is all very true, but there is another truth even for those young people who do get a college degree. Many of them are unable to find jobs which are commensurate with their education.

Mr. Speaker, when we read in the papers, and Mr. Bush used to tell us this, and President Clinton tells us this as well, that millions and millions of new jobs are being created, that is true. That is true. A lot of new jobs are being created, but the reality is that the majority of new jobs that are being created in America today pay less than \$7 an hour. Many of these jobs offer no health benefits, no retirement benefits, no time off for vacations or sick leave. In fact, more and more of the new jobs that are being created are part-time jobs or temporary jobs. If you can believe it, in 1993 one-third of the U.S. work force was comprised of "contingent labor." That means people who work for a few months and then lose their jobs, and that number is escalating rapidly.

In the last 10 years the United States has lost 3 million white collar jobs. We have lost 1.8 million jobs in manufacturing in the past 5 years alone. If we are going to try to understand why our wages are going down, why so many people are living in economic anxiety, we must address the issue of so-called downsizing.

Downsizing is a polite corporate term for throwing American workers out on the street, and this downsizing phenomenon is taking place at a frightening degree among some of the largest and most powerful corporations in America. Five companies alone, Ford, AT&T, General Electric, ITT, and Union Carbide laid off over 800,000 American workers in the last 15 years, just those five companies alone.

Mr. Speaker, you know when we talk about family values, when we talk

about the importance of adults being good parents, of adult parents having the time to spend quality moments with their kids, one of the things that we should realize is that, as a result of the economic downturn and decline in real wages, the average American worker today is now working 160 hours a year more than he or she worked in 1969. The number of Americans working at more than one job has almost doubled over the last 15 years. In my rural State of Vermont it is now uncommon to find workers working not just two jobs, but three jobs, in order to bring home the bacon and to pay the bills.

□ 2300

I remember when I was in college, they used to give courses on what they called leisure time. They were worried then as technology developed and workers would be working fewer hours, what would the American worker do with all of his or her spare time? Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, they do not give those courses anymore. Nobody worries what the American worker is going to do with his or her spare time, because that worker does not have any spare time. Rather, they give courses now on how to deal with the terrible stress that families are under when wives do not see their husbands and husbands do not see their kids, because everybody is working at crazy hours, trying to keep their family above water.

Mr. Speaker, not only are real wages going down. There is another crisis that, certainly, this Congress is not dealing with, and in fact is making a very bad situation worse. That is that one-third of all Americans do not have adequate medical insurance, and the number is growing.

Two years ago in this House, we dealt with that goal. I disagreed with Clinton's plan, it was too complicated, too cumbersome, but at least he had a vision that said that every man, woman, and child in America should have health insurance. Now that that debate is over, the situation which was bad then is worse today. More Americans lack health care than was the case a few years ago. More Americans have inadequate health insurance, large deductibles, large copayments than was the case several years ago.

Mr. Speaker, the ultimate reality of what is happening in this country today is that while the richest people are becoming much richer, while the middle class is shrinking and more of the middle class is falling into poverty, the other reality is that poverty has risen rapidly in recent years.

Poverty in the United States declined significantly between 1965 and 1973, and we hear some of our Republican friends say, "Well, the war on poverty was terrible, terrible." The war on poverty had an impact in reduc-

ing poverty in America, in moving us toward fewer poor people, when at a time the trend today is, unfortunately, in the wrong direction.

Clearly, one of the statistics that we as a nation should be profoundly ashamed of, profoundly embarrassed about, is that 22 percent of our children live in poverty, and this great Nation has the dubious distinction of having by far the highest rate of childhood poverty in the industrialized world. I heard some of our Republican friends a moment ago talk to us about so-called welfare reform. I hope that they understand that the welfare reform proposal that they are advocating will increase the ranks of childhood poverty by another 1 million children in America.

Yes, we do need welfare reform. Yes, we do, but we do not need so-called reform which will add another 1 million children to the ranks of the poor.

Mr. Speaker, when we talk of social justice, we should also look at what goes on in the industrial sector of America today. We should ask why in 1980, the average CEO in America earned 42 times what the average factory worker earned. Some people may say, "42 times? Does he eat 42 times more? Do his children have 42 times more than the workers' children?"

If you think that situation was bad, what we should appreciate is that today, the CEO's of the largest corporations earn 149 times what their workers earn. What justice is there in that? Corporate salaries zooming up, stock options for corporate executives going up, real wages for workers going down, CEO's earning almost 150 times what their workers today receive.

Mr. Speaker, we hear a lot of discussion about taxation, and certainly taxation is an important issue. But what we do not hear a whole lot of discussion about is who is paying the taxes. Who is paying the taxes? In my humble opinion, the middle class and the working class. In fact, if you look at local taxes, State taxes, and Federal taxes, they are paying far too much in taxes. But on the other hand, when you look at upper-income people and when you look at large corporations, what we can say is those folks deserve to contribute more into our tax coffers, so we could deal with the Federal deficit, so we could take the tax burden off middle-income America.

Mr. Speaker, in 1977 President Carter, and in 1981 and 1986 President Reagan, instituted "tax reform." Of course, the Democrats controlled the Congress during that period, and supported that so-called tax reform. The result of those reforms was to significantly lower taxes on the wealthy and the large corporations and raise taxes on almost everyone else. Taxes on the very wealthy were cut by over 12 percent, while taxes on working- and middle-class Americans increased. One of those so-called reforms was a large in-

crease in the regressive Social Security tax.

According to a study conducted by the House Committee on Ways and Means, the top 1 percent of taxpayers saved an average of over \$41,000 in 1992 over what their taxes would have been at 1977 rates. Mr. Speaker, we speak a whole lot about the Federal deficit, which is a very important issue, but what we should appreciate is that if 1977 individual Federal tax rates had still been in effect in 1992, the Nation's wealthiest 1 percent would have paid \$83.7 billion more in taxes, or about one-third of the national deficit in 1995. That is an important fact that we should keep in mind.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when the richest 1 percent of the population own about 50 percent of the stock, massive tax cuts to corporations have also helped to enrich the wealthy and to cut back on Federal revenues. In the 1960's, corporations contributed 23.4 percent of the Nation's taxes. Today, they contribute only 9 percent. During the early 1980's, some of the largest and most profitable corporations in America paid nothing in Federal taxes. By contrast, individual income tax increased from 22 percent of Federal receipts in the 1960's to 45 percent today.

Mr. Speaker, I have talked a bit, just a bit, about some of the problems facing this country. I think it is fair and I also talk about some of the areas that I think we need to move forward on if we are going to solve some of these problems. Let me just touch on a few of them.

No. 1, it is an absolute disgrace that in this country we continue to have a national minimum wage of \$4.25 an hour. Mr. Speaker, the purchasing power of the minimum wage has declined by 26 percent over the last 20 years. That means our minimum wage workers today are far poorer, have far less purchasing power, than did the minimum wage workers 20 years ago. The minimum wage in America must be raised. It must be raised so that if people work 40 hours a week, they do not live in poverty. That is why I have introduced legislation which would raise the minimum wage to \$5.50 an hour.

Mr. Speaker, when we talk about why it is that American workers are seeing a decline in their standard of living, there is no question that we must address a very, very failed trade policy. It is not only that NAFTA has been a disaster, it is not only that most-favored-nation status with China is wrong, it is not only, in my view, that GATT is wrong. Our entire trade policy is failing.

I find it amazing that every day on the floor of this House we hear endless discussion about our national Federal deficit, which in fact is a serious problem, but we hear virtually no discussion about the trade deficit. The trade



deficit this year will be, as I understand it, at the highest level in American history, about \$160 billion. Economists tell us that for every billion dollars of trade, we create 20,000 jobs. That means that the difference between a \$160 billion trade deficit, a neutral trade deficit, is over 3 million jobs, many of them good-paying manufacturing jobs.

□ 2310

Now, how long can we continue to go on seeing our industrial base get smaller and smaller; seeing more and more American companies moving to Mexico, moving to Malaysia, moving to China, where they can hire workers for 20 cents an hour?

Clearly, we must address the crisis in the deindustrialization of America. The crisis in our current trade policy, the crisis in which corporate America is creating millions of jobs all over the world, it is just that they are not creating jobs in America. Clearly, we must develop a policy which says to these corporations, "You have got to reinvest in America and not just in China or in Mexico."

Mr. Speaker, it also seems to me that we have got to make our tax system a heck of a lot fairer than it is today. Today in America, we have the most unequal and unfair distribution of wealth in the entire industrialized world. We also have the most unfair and unequal distribution of income in the industrialized world.

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated earlier, during the 1970's and 1980's, this Congress, and various Presidents, gave huge tax breaks to the wealthiest people in America and to the largest corporations, while at the same time they raised the Social Security taxes. They raised taxes on the middle class, and as a result of Federal policy, local and State taxes were also raised all over America.

Mr. Speaker, there are many people who are concerned about the complexity of our tax system, its burdensome nature, all of the loopholes that exist. I share that concern. It seems to me that we must move forward toward a simpler tax system without loopholes, but a tax system which is progressive. That means the more money a person makes, the higher percentage of their income they pay in taxes.

That means if middle income and working people are seeing a decline in their real wages, that has to be taken into account when we formulate our tax system, and the tax burden that those people are currently experiencing must be relaxed.

Mr. Speaker, I think that one of the surprises that the American people are soon going to see, and this Congress will soon see, is a revitalized labor movement. I fully support that, and was very delighted recently when John Sweeney, the former president of the

Service Employees Industrial Union, the SEIU, became the president of the AFL-CIO. Rich Trumka, the former president of the United Mine Workers, became the secretary treasurer of the AFL-CIO.

Mr. Speaker, I think what we are going to see is a revitalized labor movement that is going to be more actively involved on the political front and far more actively involved in organizing workers into unions. The reality is that workers who are in unions, who are able to negotiate collectively with their companies, earn of course significantly higher wages than do nonunion workers.

Today, not every American worker wants to join a union, and those workers who do not want to join a union, they should not join a union. But there are millions of workers who do want to join a union, and we must provide legislation for those workers that gives them a fair opportunity to join a union.

In my State of Vermont, and all over this country, there are workers who are trying to join a union, who are trying to organize for unions, who are being fired by their bosses with impunity. Employers can do it. No problem. There are elections that are being held and that after the union wins, the companies are appealing, and the bottom line of all of this is that labor law today favors company and the bosses far more than the workers.

Workers join unions, but they cannot negotiate the first contract. The employer refuses to sit down and the workers give up and the union dissipates. I think it is terribly important when we talk about ways that we can improve life for ordinary Americans that we institute major labor law reform which says nothing more than, if the workers in a given area want to join a union, they have the right to join that union without being fired, without being harassed, without having to go through a dozen different appeals, without having their organizers fired by their employers.

Mr. Speaker, there are two other issues that I want to briefly touch on. In this Congress tonight for the last many months we have been talking a great deal about Medicare, and some of us are outraged that at a time when millions and millions of elderly people today, with Medicare under its present funding formula, today many, many elderly people are finding it very difficult to provide for their health care needs.

Mr. Speaker, Medicare does not cover prescription drugs. And in my State of Vermont, and throughout this country, large numbers of seniors cannot afford their prescription drugs. Medicare does not provide long-term care in nursing homes. So, the Medicare Program today is not terribly good in terms of providing for our senior citizens.

Clearly, it will become a lot worse if the Gingrich proposal goes into effect and Medicare premiums go up for the elderly and Medicare and Medicaid funding for hospitals is radically cut. The point is we are now forced in this Congress to fight and spend our energy fighting those cuts, but I think very shortly we should return back to the basic debate. That is not just stopping cuts in Medicare, but trying to determine why it is that this country is not doing what virtually every other industrialized nation on Earth has done, and that is to provide a national health care system which guarantees health care to all people.

North of Vermont there is Canada, and every Canadian has a little card. With that card they go to any doctor they want; they go to any hospital they want; and they do not take out their wallets. Mr. Speaker, know what? The poor are treated quite as well as the rich.

Does that system have problems? Sure it does. But what it has done is made sure that every person in Canada gets all of the health care they need without out-of-pocket expense. Throughout Europe and throughout Scandinavia there are different types of health care systems. Some work better than others, but clearly it is a terrible disgrace that in this country we have some 40 million Americans with no health insurance, and more than that who have inadequate health insurance.

Clearly, we must again put on the table the fight for a national health care system; in my view a single-payer national health care system which guarantees health care to all people.

Mr. Speaker, when I go back to Vermont, and I am sure it is true for other Members who go back to their districts, they hear from their constituents, and their constituents say, "Government just is not working well. Why is government not working well?" And they are wrong. Government is working very, very well for those people who have a whole lot of money.

Mr. Speaker, if Americans are in the upper 1 percent, the upper 2 percent, are making \$300,000, \$500,000 a year, this Government is doing a great job for them. They have never had it better. Their tax rates have gone down. They have more power over their employees. Some of our Republican friends want to take away the restrictions which prevent them from polluting the environment. Government is working great for those people who are the upper-income people.

But, Mr. Speaker, for the vast majority of people it is true, Government is not working well. We have to ask why. That takes us to the whole issue of campaign finance reform.

Mr. Speaker, it is a very scary proposition that in the last national election that we had, November 1994, when Mr.

GINGRICH and the Republicans took power here and Republicans took power in the Senate, that all of 38.5 percent of the people came out to vote. That is pretty bad.

It is even more scary to understand the role that money has in the political process. Frankly, I get a little bit tired of hearing about all the millionaires and billionaires who continue to run for office. If we continue to have millionaires running for office and getting elected, not only to Congress but to seats in various State houses and Governors' offices, maybe we should change the name of this institution from the House of Representatives to the House of Lords, and be clear that what this is is a hall for the privileged ladies and gentlemen of the upper class who have purchased their seats by taking out their wallets and spending millions and millions of dollars to get elected.

□ 2320

That is not what democracy is about. We should not be buying seats in Congress or buying seats in the Senate or buying seats in Governors' offices all over America. Clearly, we need campaign finance reform. The elements of that reform to my mind most importantly must be a limitation on how much an individual can spend when he or she runs for office, let us have a level playing field.

No. 2, we should be matching public funding with small contributions. If somebody is able to go out and get a significant number of checks for \$25 or \$50, we should match the public funding. If we do that, we will have a fairer playing field and the wealthy and the powerful will not be able to buy seats in the U.S. Congress and, therefore, have a Congress which supports their agenda.

Far too often politics in this institution is about is payback time, payback time. You contribute a whole lot of money to the party of your choice and lo and behold, you get huge tax breaks for corporations, tax breaks for the wealthy, and other Government policy which favors those people who have money.

The last point that I want to make, Mr. Speaker, is that I think perhaps the most frightening development which is taking place in our country today is that tens and tens of millions of Americans, mostly low income and working people, are giving up on the political process. They do not vote. They do not get involved locally. They do not pay attention to what is going on. And in many ways, this country is becoming less and less democratic as a result of that.

If people out there, people throughout this country, think that politics is not important, that what happens in this institution is not important, pay attention to what is happening now. If

you are a young person who works for a living and you are receiving an earned tax credit, understand that that earned income tax credit is going to be cut so that we can provide tax breaks for the wealthiest people in this country. Do you think that is important? It will be harder for you to raise your family.

If you think that politics is not important, we should ask the elderly people who will be forced to pay \$300 a year more in premiums for Medicare. We should ask those families throughout the country today who have disabled members in their family, who have children, who are going to see major cutbacks in Medicaid. That is what politics is about.

If you think that politics is not important and you are a young person trying to go to college and you do not have a whole lot of money, understand that as a result of politics, understand that as a result of decisions being made right here in this House of Representatives, it may be impossible for large numbers of working class young people to afford to go to college because of major cutbacks in student loans and in student grants.

If you are a veteran who has put your life on the line defending this country, understand that what politics is about is that veterans programs are going to be cut so that we can build more B-2 bombers that the Pentagon does not even want.

Yes, you may not think so, but politics is relevant to every person's life in America. The politics of what is going on here today is that the wealthy people to a very large degree own this institution. If you want to know what goes on, all you have to do is follow the money. The money is coming in and decisions are being made which reward those people who have the money. The only way to stop it is if the vast majority of the American people, the people who are working long hours and are not getting a fair shake in terms of the wages they are receiving, people who do not have health insurance, people who cannot afford to send their kids to college, the decent people of this country, the backbone of this country, if those people begin to stand up and fight for their rights, we can turn this institution around. We can turn this country around. But if you do not, then what will happen is the wealthy, small numbers of people but people with tremendous resources will continue to dominate this institution. That is what the struggle is about.

So I would hope that people who pay homage, Veterans Day just came, and we paid our respect and homage to the men and women who put their lives on the line, but what they did is fought to keep this country free and to keep this country a democracy. We are not honoring them, if we do not get involved in the political process, if we do not stand

up and fight for policies which impact all the people of this country and not just the very wealthy. That is what politics is about.

## RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. BARR of Georgia). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the House will now stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 2347

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BARR) at 11 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PALLONE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. OLIVER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WISE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FOLEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ENGLISH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KIM, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FOLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ANDREWS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. TAUZIN.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

Ms. BROWN of Florida.

(The following Member (at her own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. DELAURO, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

Mr. STENHOLM.

Mr. LEACH.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE.



## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PALLONE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.

Mr. JACOBS.

Mr. MANTON.

Mr. STARK.

Mr. SERRANO.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY.

Mr. CARDIN.

Mr. ORTIZ.

Mr. STOKES in two instances.

Mrs. MALONEY.

Mr. FILNER.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FOLEY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DAVIS.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington.

Mr. HORN.

Mr. GILMAN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SANDERS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. TEJEDA.

Mrs. CLAYTON.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.

## SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 325. An act to make certain technical corrections in laws relating to Native Americans, and for other purposes; to the Committees on Resources, Economic and Educational Opportunities, Commerce, the Judiciary, and Agriculture.

## ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee has examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2394. An act to increase, effective as of December 1, 1995, the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans;

H.R. 2586. An act to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2589. An act to extend authorities under the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act of 1994 until December 31, 1995, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 115. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996 and for other purposes.

## BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that

committee did on the following date present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following title:

On November 12, 1995:

H.R. 2586. An act to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2589. An act to extend authorities under the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act of 1994 until December 31, 1995, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 2394. An act to increase, effective as of December 1, 1995, the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, November 14, 1995, at 9 a.m.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1658. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the annual report on conditional registration of pesticides during fiscal year 1994, pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 136w-4; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1659. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting legislative language for the Federal crop insurance title of the 1995 farm bill, to the Committee on Agriculture.

1660. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the annual report on the Youth Conservation Corps Program in the Department for fiscal year 1994, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 1705; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

1661. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting the Department's report on the evaluation of utility early replacement programs for alliances, pursuant to Public Law 102-486, section 127(a), 128 (106 Stat. 2835, 2836); to the Committee on Commerce.

1662. A letter from the Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's superfund financial activities at the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry for fiscal year 1993, pursuant to Public Law 99-499, Section 120(e)(5)(100 Stat. 1669); to the Committee on Commerce.

1663. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting the Department's report on the status of the U.S. uranium industry at the end of calendar year 1994, pursuant to the Energy Policy Act of 1992; to the Committee on Commerce.

1664. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting the Department's study of a representative sample of light-duty alternative fuel vehicles in Federal fleets, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 6374(b)(1); to the Committee on Commerce.

1665. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting the Department's report on the current status and likely impacts of integrated resource planning in the United States; to the Committee on Commerce.

1666. A letter from the Inspector General, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's annual report to Congress summarizing the Agency's progress during fiscal year 1994 in implementing the requirements of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, as amended, pursuant to Public Law 99-499, section 120(e)(5) (100 Stat. 1669); to the Committee on Commerce.

1667. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certifications and waivers and their justification under section 565(b) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, fiscal years 1994 and 1995 of the prohibition against contracting with firms that comply with the Arab League boycott of the State of Israel contracting with firms that discriminate in the award of subcontracts on the basis of religion, pursuant to Public Law 103-236, section 565(b) (108 Stat. 845); to the Committee on International Relations.

1668. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Land Minerals Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the annual report on royalty management and collection activities for Federal and Indian mineral leases in 1993 and 1994, pursuant to 30 U.S.C. 237; to the Committee on Resources.

1669. A letter from the Administrator, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's report entitled "Storm Water Discharges Potentially Addressed by Phase II Of The National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Storm Water Program"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1670. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the Department's second edition of the Surface Transportation Research and Development plan, pursuant to Public Law 102-240, section 6009(b)(8) (105 Stat. 2177); jointly, to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Science.

1671. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the fiscal year 1996 budget requests of the Federal Aviation Administration, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 48109; jointly, to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Science.

1672. A letter from the Chair, Good Neighbor Environmental Board, transmitting the first annual report of the Good Neighbor Environmental Board; jointly, to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Commerce.

1673. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting the Department's report entitled "Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and Wetlands: Special Statistical Report, July 1995"; jointly, to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Resources, and Agriculture.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MOORHEAD: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2361. A bill to amend the commencement dates of certain temporary Federal judgeships (Rept. 104-334). Referred to

the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 265, Resolution waiving a requirement of clause 4(b) of rule XI with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules (Rept. 104-335). Referred to the House Calendar.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ARCHER:

H.R. 2621. A bill to enforce the public debt limit and to protect the Social Security trust funds and other Federal trust funds and accounts invested in public debt obligations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARDIN:

H.R. 2622. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to require that budget resolutions be joint resolutions and that those resolutions contain extensions of the statutory limit on the public debt, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA:

H.R. 2623. A bill to amend the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to make the provisions and benefits of Indian self-determination contracts applicable to Indian self-governance compacts; to the Committee on Resources.

H.R. 2624. A bill to establish the American Samoa Study Commission; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 2625. A bill to prohibit future obligation of funds for the B-2 bomber procurement program; to the Committee on National Security.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON (for himself and Mr. STUMP):

H.R. 2626. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure that payments of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and payments of dependency and indemnity compensation for survivors of such veterans are made regardless of Government financial shortfalls; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 89: Mr. ROTH.  
H.R. 127: Mrs. THURMAN and Mr. BILBRAY.  
H.R. 528: Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. BALDACCIO, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. FORBES, Mr. STARK, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. PORTER, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, and Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska.

H.R. 580: Ms. KAPTUR.  
H.R. 789: Mr. RAMSTAD.  
H.R. 1140: Mr. TOWNS.  
H.R. 1355: Mr. OWENS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. EVANS, Mr. TORRES, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. WATT

of North Carolina, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Ms. NORTON, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. FATTAH.  
H.R. 1619: Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. CLYBURN.  
H.R. 2098: Mr. PARKER.  
H.R. 2240: Mr. MARTINI and Ms. WOOLSEY.  
H.R. 2276: Mr. TRAFICANT.  
H.R. 2281: Ms. DELAUNO and Mr. BALDACCIO.  
H.R. 2342: Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas.  
H.R. 2373: Mrs. LINCOLN.

H.R. 2458: Mr. PORTER, Mr. PAXON, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. FRAZER.

H.R. 2472: Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. MANTON, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 2508: Mr. SKELTON and Mr. WICKER.

H.R. 2529: Mr. TORRES, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. FURSE, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 2540: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. WAMP, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. WELLER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. LARGENT, and Mr. EMERSON.

H.R. 2564: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee, Mr. COBLE, Mr. FLANAGAN, Mr. HEINEMAN, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mrs. ROUKEMA.

H.R. 2579: Mr. BERREUTER, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. CANADY, and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.

H.J. Res. 89: Mr. LAHOOD.

H. Con. Res. 50: Mr. DOYLE.

H. Res. 220: Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. ROYBAL-AL-LARD, and Ms. LOFGREN.

## AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2539

OFFERED BY: MR. SHUSTER

AMENDMENT No. 1: Page 5, line 24, insert "common carrier" after "a person providing".

Page 7, line 8, insert "with respect to regulation of rail transportation" after "provided under this part".

Page 9, line 24, insert "The enactment of the ICC Termination Act of 1995 shall have no effect on which employees and employers are covered by the Railway Labor Act, the Railroad Retirement Act of 1974, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act." after "local governmental authority".

Page 12, in the table of sections for subchapter I of chapter 105, strike "Inflation-based rate increases" and insert in lieu thereof "Rail cost adjustment factor".

Page 13, line 21, strike "shall recognize" and insert in lieu thereof "shall give due consideration to—

"(A) the amount of traffic which is transported at revenues which do not contribute to going concern value and the efforts made to minimize such traffic;

"(B) the amount of traffic which contributes only marginally to fixed costs and the extent to which, if any, rates on such traffic can be changed to maximize the revenues from such traffic; and

"(C) the carrier's mix of rail traffic to determine whether one commodity is paying an unreasonable share of the carrier's overall revenues, recognizing".

Page 14, lines 2 through 5, strike "to establish simplified" and all that follows through "evidence is impractical".

Page 14, line 11, strike "including" and insert in lieu thereof "to the extent required by section 10507".

Page 17, line 11, strike "11101" and insert in lieu thereof "10902".

Page 29, line 11, strike "Class I".

Page 29, lines 12 and 13, strike "Panel's Rail Form A" and insert in lieu thereof "Uniform Rail Costing System".

Page 30, line 7, through page 31, line 3, amend section 10508 to read as follows:

### "§ 10508. Rail cost adjustment factor

"(a) The Panel shall, as often as practicable, but in no event less often than quarterly, publish a rail cost adjustment factor which shall be a fraction, the numerator of which is the latest published Index of Railroad Costs (which index shall be compiled or verified by the Panel, with appropriate adjustments to reflect the change in composition of railroad costs, including the quality and mix of material and labor) and the denominator of which is the same index for the fourth quarter of every fifth year, beginning with the fourth quarter of 1992.

"(b) The rail cost adjustment factor published by the Panel under subsection (a) of this section shall take into account changes in railroad productivity. The Panel shall also publish a similar index that does not take into account changes in railroad productivity.

Page 31, line 22, insert "The district courts of the United States shall not have jurisdiction pursuant to this section based on section 1331 or 1337 of title 28, United States Code," after "parties otherwise agree."

Page 31, after line 22, insert the following:

"(d)(1) A summary of each contract for the transportation of agricultural commodities entered into under this section shall be filed with the Panel, containing such nonconfidential information as the Panel prescribes. The Panel shall publish special rules for such contracts in order to ensure that the essential terms of the contract are available to the general public.

Page 31, line 23, strike "(d)" and insert in lieu thereof "(2)".

Page 32, after line 6, insert the following new subsection:

"(f) A rail carrier that enters into a contract as authorized by this section remains subject to the common carrier obligation set forth in section 10901, with respect to rail transportation not provided under such a contract.

Page 37, in the table of sections for chapter 107, insert at the end the following new item: "10707. Railroad development.

Page 45, line 10, strike "paragraph (2) or".  
Page 45, lines 13 through 22, strike paragraph (2).

Page 45, line 23, strike "(3)" and insert in lieu thereof "(2)".

Page 47, line 18, strike "6 months" and insert in lieu thereof "4 months".

Page 48, line 2, page 49, lines 21 and 25, and page 50, line 5, strike "6-month" and insert in lieu thereof "4-month".

Page 51, line 20, insert "The Panel does not have authority under this chapter over construction, acquisition, operation, abandonment, or discontinuance of spur, industrial, team, switching, or side tracks," after "or side tracks".

Page 51, after line 20, insert the following new section:

### "§ 10707. Railroad development

"(a) In this section, the term 'financially responsible person' means a person who—

"(1) is capable of paying the constitutional minimum value of the railroad line proposed to be acquired; and



"(2) is able to assure that adequate transportation will be provided over such line for a period of not less than 3 years.

Such term includes a governmental authority but does not include a Class I or Class II rail carrier.

"(b)(1) When the Panel finds that—

"(A)(i) the public convenience and necessity require or permit the sale of a particular railroad line under this section; or

"(ii) a railroad line is on a system diagram map as required under section 10703 of this title, but the rail carrier owning such line has not filed a notice of intent to abandon such line under section 10703 of this title before an application to purchase such line, or any required preliminary filing with respect to such application, is filed under this section; and

"(B) an application to purchase such line has been filed by a financially responsible person,

the Panel shall require the rail carrier owning the railroad line to sell such line to such financially responsible person at a price not less than the constitutional minimum value.

"(2) For purposes of this subsection, the constitutional minimum value of a particular railroad line shall be presumed to be not less than the net liquidation value of such line or the going concern value of such line, whichever is greater.

"(c)(1) For purposes of this section, the Panel may determine that the public convenience and necessity require or permit the sale of a railroad line if the Panel determines, after a hearing on the record, that—

"(A) the rail carrier operating such line refuses within a reasonable time to make the necessary efforts to provide adequate service to shippers who transport traffic over such line;

"(B) the transportation over such line is inadequate for the majority of shippers who transport traffic over such line;

"(C) the sale of such line will not have a significantly adverse financial effect on the rail carrier operating such line;

"(D) the sale of such line will not have an adverse effect on the overall operational performance of the rail carrier operating such line; and

"(E) the sale of such line will be likely to result in improved railroad transportation for shippers that transport traffic over such line.

"(2) In a proceeding under this subsection, the burden of proving that the public convenience and necessity require or permit the sale of a particular railroad line is on the person filing the application to acquire such line. If the Panel finds under this subsection that the public convenience and necessity require or permit the sale of a particular railroad line, the Panel shall concurrently notify the parties of such finding and publish such finding in the Federal Register.

"(d) In the case of any railroad line subject to sale under subsection (a) of this section, the Panel shall, upon the request of the acquiring carrier, require the selling carrier to provide to the acquiring carrier trackage rights to allow a reasonable interchange with the selling carrier or to move power equipment or empty rolling stock between noncontiguous feeder lines operated by the acquiring carrier. The Panel shall require the acquiring carrier to provide the selling carrier reasonable compensation for any such trackage rights.

"(e) The Panel shall require, to the maximum extent practicable, the use of the employees who would normally have performed work in connection with a railroad line subject to a sale under this section.

"(f) In the case of a railroad line which carried less than 3,000,000 gross ton miles of traffic per mile in the preceding calendar year, whenever a purchasing carrier under this section petitions the Panel for joint rates applicable to traffic moving over through routes in which the purchasing carrier may practicably participate, the Panel shall, within 30 days after the date such petition is filed and pursuant to section 10505(a) of this title, require the establishment of reasonable joint rates and divisions over such route.

"(g)(1) Any person operating a railroad line acquired under this section may elect to be exempt from any of the provisions of this part, except that such a person may not be exempt from the provisions of chapter 105 of this title with respect to transportation under a joint rate.

"(2) The provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection shall apply to any line of railroad which was abandoned during the 18-month period immediately prior to the effective date of the Staggers Rail Act of 1980 and was subsequently purchased by a financially responsible person.

"(h) If a purchasing carrier under this section proposes to sell or abandon all or any portion of a purchased railroad line, such purchasing carrier shall offer the right of first refusal with respect to such line or portion thereof to the carrier which sold such line under this section. Such offer shall be made at a price equal to the sum of the price paid by such purchasing carrier to such selling carrier for such line or portion thereof and the fair market value (less deterioration) of any improvements made, as adjusted to reflect inflation.

"(i) Any person operating a railroad line acquired under this section may determine preconditions, such as payment of a subsidy, which must be met by shippers in order to obtain service over such lines, but such operator must notify the shippers on the line of its intention to impose such preconditions.

Page 52, line 9, insert "Commitments which deprive a carrier of its ability to respond to reasonable requests for common carrier service are not reasonable." after "requests for service."

Page 53, line 3, insert "20 days have expired after" after "service terms unless".

Page 53, lines 11 and 12, strike ", including appropriate periods of notice." and insert in lieu thereof ". Final regulations shall be adopted by the Panel not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the ICC Termination Act of 1995."

Page 66, line 12, insert "in order to perfect the security interest that is the subject of such instrument" after "filed with the Panel".

Page 68, after line 15, insert the following new subsection:

"(g) The Panel shall collect, maintain, and keep open for public inspection a railway equipment register consistent with the manner and format maintained by the Interstate Commerce Commission as of the date of the enactment of the ICC Termination Act of 1995.

Page 69, line 8, insert "(except section 11122)" after "under this subchapter".

Page 73, line 19, strike "rights. Any trackage rights" and insert in lieu thereof "rights and access to other facilities. Any trackage rights and related".

Page 73, line 20, insert "operating terms and" after "shall provide for".

Page 74, lines 21 and 22, strike "Secretary of Transportation" and insert in lieu thereof "Attorney General".

Page 84, lines 2 and 3, strike "The Panel may begin an investigation under this part on its own initiative or on complaint." and insert in lieu thereof "Except as otherwise provided in this part, the Panel may begin an investigation under this part only on complaint."

Page 85, line 24, insert "in a United States District Court" after "civil action".

Page 105, line 3, strike the first comma and all that follows through the period on line 5 and insert a period.

Page 115, line 6, before "authority" insert "appropriate".

Page 115, strike lines 7 and 8 and insert a period.

Page 117, line 4, strike "shall".

Page 132, line 4, strike "has" and insert "and the Panel have".

Page 133, after line 17, insert the following: "(b) LIMITATION.—The Panel may not exempt a water carrier from the application of, or compliance with, sections 13701 and 13702 for transportation in noncontiguous domestic trade.

Page 133, line 18, strike "(b)" and insert "(c)".

Page 136, line 2, after "section 13703" insert "or 14302".

Page 136, in the matter following line 3—

(1) redesignate the items relating to sections 13707–13712 as items relating to sections 13708–13713, respectively;

(2) insert after the item relating to section 13706 the following:

"13707. Payment of rates."; and

(3) strike the item relating to section 13710, as redesignated by paragraph (1), and insert the following:

"13710. Additional billing and collecting practices."

Page 136, lines 14 and 15, strike "described in section 13102(9)(A), or" and insert a comma.

Page 136, line 17, after the comma insert "or".

Page 136, after line 17, insert the following:

"(C) rates, rules, and classifications made collectively by motor carriers under agreement pursuant to section 13703.

Page 138, lines 9 and 10, strike "described in section 13102(9)(A)".

Page 140, line 13, strike "kept open" and insert "make the tariffs as changed available".

Page 141, line 11, strike "in" and insert "of".

Page 141, lines 12 and 13, strike "households described in section 13102(9)(B)" and insert "household goods".

Page 142, line 7, strike "described in section 13102(9)(A)".

Page 143, strike lines 5 through 8 and insert the following:

"(4) INDEPENDENTLY ESTABLISHED RATES.—Any carrier which is a party to an agreement under paragraph (1) is not, and may not be precluded, from independently establishing its own rates, classification, and mileages or from adopting and using a noncollectively made classification or mileage guide.

"(5) INVESTIGATIONS.—

"(A) REASONABLENESS.—The Panel may suspend and investigate the reasonableness of any rate, rule, classification, or rate adjustment of general application made pursuant to an agreement under this section.

"(B) ACTIONS NOT IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST.—The Panel may investigate any action taken pursuant to an agreement approved under this section. If the Panel finds that the action is not in the public interest, the Panel may take such measures as may be necessary to protect the public interest with regard to the action, including issuing an order

directing the parties to cease and desist or modify the action.

Page 143, line 9, strike "(5)" and insert "(6)".

Page 144, line 18, after the period insert the following:

Parties to the agreement may continue to undertake activities pursuant to the previously approved agreement while the renewal request is pending.

Page 145, strike line 11 and insert the following:

"(g) INDUSTRY STANDARD GUIDES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—

"(A) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—Routes, rates, classifications, mileage guides, and rules established under agreements approved under this section shall be published and made available for public inspection upon request.

"(B) PARTICIPATION OF CARRIERS.—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—A motor carrier of property whose routes, rates, classifications, mileage guides, rules, or packaging are determined or governed by publications established under agreements approved under this section must participate in the determining or governing publication for such provisions to apply.

"(ii) POWER OF ATTORNEY.—The motor carrier of property shall issue a power of attorney to the publishing agent and, upon its acceptance, the agent shall issue a written certification to the motor carrier affirming its participation in the governing publication, and the certification shall be made available for public inspection.

"(2) MILEAGE LIMITATION.—No carrier subject

Page 145, line 15, strike "(1)" and insert "(A)".

Page 145, move lines 15 through 21 two ems to the right.

Page 145, strike line 16 and all that follows through "which" on line 17 and insert "that is developed independently of any other publication of mileage developed by any other carrier and that".

Page 145, line 19, strike "(2)" and insert "(B)".

Page 149, after line 16, insert the following:

#### "§ 13707. Payment of rates

"(a) TRANSFER OF POSSESSION UPON PAYMENT.—Except as provided in subsection (b), a carrier providing transportation or service subject to jurisdiction under this part shall give up possession at the destination of the property transported by it only when payment for the transportation or service is made.

"(b) EXCEPTIONS.—

"(1) REGULATIONS.—Under regulations of the Secretary governing the payment for transportation and service and preventing discrimination, those carriers may give up possession at destination of property transported by them before payment for the transportation or service. The regulations of the Secretary may provide for weekly or monthly payment for transportation provided by motor carriers and for periodic payment for transportation provided by water carriers.

"(2) EXTENSIONS OF CREDIT TO GOVERNMENTAL ENTITIES.—Such a carrier (including a motor carrier being used by a household goods freight forwarder) may extend credit for transporting property for the United States Government, a State, a territory or possession of the United States, or a political subdivision of any of them.

Redesignate subsequent sections of chapter 137 on pages 149 through 163, accordingly.

Page 149, line 18, strike "TIMING" and insert "DISCLOSURE".

Page 149, line 23, before the period insert "and shall also disclose, at such time, whether and to whom any allowance or reduction in charges is made".

Page 150, lines 13 and 14, strike "BEFORE EFFECTIVE DATE" and insert "AT RATES OTHER THAN LEGAL TARIFF RATES".

Page 150, line 21, after the comma insert "or under subchapter I of chapter 135".

Page 151, line 12, after "Commission" insert "or the Panel, as required".

Page 151, line 20, after "Commission" insert "or the Panel, as required".

Page 152, line 21, before the period insert "or chapter 149".

Page 154, line 7, before "title" insert "part or, for transportation provided before the effective date of this section, all rights and remedies that existed under this".

Page 157, strike lines 11 and 12 and insert the following:

#### "§ 13710. Additional billing and collecting practices"

Page 157, line 20, after "rate" insert "applicable to its shipment or".

Page 157, line 23, strike "With" and all that follows through "when" on line 25 and insert "When".

Page 158, line 5, strike "In those cases" and insert the following:

"(3) BILLING DISPUTES.—

"(A) INITIATED BY MOTOR CARRIERS.—In those cases"

Page 158, strike line 16 and all that follows through "if" on line 18 and insert the following:

"(B) INITIATED BY SHIPPERS.—If".

Page 160, line 1, before "that" insert "subject to jurisdiction under subchapter I of chapter 135 or, before the effective date of this section, to have provided transportation".

Page 160, line 2, strike "before" and insert "as in effect on the day before".

Page 160, line 7, after "between" insert "(1)".

Page 160, line 8, after "with" insert "this chapter or, with respect to transportation provided before the effective date of this section, in accordance with".

Page 160, line 9, strike "of this title" and insert "as in effect on the date the transportation was provided".

Page 160, line 10, strike "and" and insert "and (2)".

Page 160, line 13, strike "of this title".

Page 160, lines 14 and 15, strike "of this title".

Page 161, line 11, after "Commission" insert "or the Panel, as required".

Page 161, line 18, after "Commission" insert "or the Panel, as required".

Page 162, line 20, strike "relating" and all that follows through the period on line 22 and insert the following:

as in effect on the day before such effective date, as such sections relate to a filed tariff rate and other general tariff requirements.

Page 163, line 1, strike "13708" and insert "13709".

Page 163, after line 8, insert the following:

"(g) APPLICABILITY TO PENDING CASES.—This section shall apply to all cases and proceedings pending on the effective date of this section.

Page 164, in the item relating to section 13904 in the matter following line 7, strike "motor carriers".

Page 168, line 18, strike "EXPRESS".

Page 169, lines 7 and 8, strike "Except as provided in section 14501(a), any" and insert "Any".

Page 169, line 11, strike "the 30th" and all that follows through "and" on line 14 and insert "such time as".

Page 169, line 16, strike the period and insert the following:

, but in no case later than the 30th day following the date on which the motor carrier of passengers first begins providing transportation entirely in one State under this paragraph.

Page 173, line 15, after "(3)" insert a comma.

Page 174, after line 11, insert the following: "(d) MOTOR CARRIER DEFINED.—In this section and sections 13905 and 13906, the term 'motor carrier' includes foreign motor carriers and foreign motor private carriers.

Page 174, line 23, strike "motor carrier".

Page 175, strike line 7 and move the matter on lines 8 through 10 after the subsection heading on line 6.

Page 175, strike lines 11 through 16.

Page 176, after line 1, insert the following:

"(a) PERSON HOLDING ICC AUTHORITY.—Any person having authority to provide transportation or service as a motor carrier, freight forwarder, or broker under this title, as in effect on the day before the effective date of this section, shall be deemed, for purposes of this part, to be registered to provide such transportation or service under this part.

Redesignate subsequent subsections on page 176 accordingly.

Page 176, line 22, strike "of the registrant".

Page 186, line 22, after the period insert the following:

In issuing the regulations, the Secretary shall consider whether or not to integrate the requirements of section 13304 into the new system and may integrate such requirements into the new system.

Page 188, line 3, strike "under section 14504," and insert "(including filings and fees authorized under section 14504)".

Page 196, line 19, before the period insert "and brokers".

Page 198, at the end of the matter following line 23, insert the following:

"14303. Consolidation, merger, and acquisition of control of motor carriers of passengers.

Page 201, line 14, strike "of this title".

Page 205, after line 11, insert the following:

"(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the following definitions apply:

"(1) HOUSEHOLD GOODS.—The term 'household goods' has the meaning such term had under section 10102(11) of this title, as in effect on the day before the effective date of this section.

"(2) TRANSPORTATION.—The term 'transportation' means transportation that would be subject to the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission under subchapter II of chapter 105 of this title, as in effect on the day before such effective date, if such subchapter were still in effect.

#### "§ 14303. Consolidation, merger, and acquisition of control of motor carriers of passengers

"(a) APPROVAL REQUIRED.—The following transactions involving motor carriers of passengers subject to jurisdiction under subchapter I of chapter 135 may be carried out only with the approval of the Panel:

"(1) Consolidation or merger of the properties or franchises of at least 2 carriers into one operation for the ownership, management, and operation of the previously separately owned properties.

"(2) A purchase, lease, or contract to operate property of another carrier by any number of carriers.

"(3) Acquisition of control of a carrier by any number of carriers.

"(4) Acquisition of control of at least 2 carriers by a person that is not a carrier.



"(5) Acquisition of control of a carrier by a person that is not a carrier but that controls any number of carriers.

"(b) STANDARD FOR APPROVAL.—The Panel shall approve and authorize a transaction under this section when it finds the transaction is consistent with the public interest. The Panel shall consider at least the following:

"(1) The effect of the proposed transaction on the adequacy of transportation to the public.

"(2) The total fixed charges that result from the proposed transaction.

"(3) The interest of carrier employees affected by the proposed transaction. The Panel may impose conditions governing the transaction.

"(c) DETERMINATION OF COMPLETENESS OF APPLICATION.—Within 30 days after the date on which an application is filed under this section, the Panel shall either publish a notice of the application in the Federal Register or reject the application if it is incomplete.

"(d) COMMENTS.—Written comments about an application may be filed with the Panel within 45 days after the date on which notice of the application is published under subsection (c).

"(e) DEADLINES.—The Panel shall conclude evidentiary proceedings by the 240th day after the date on which notice of the application is published under subsection (c). The Panel shall issue a final decision by the 180th day after the conclusion of the evidentiary proceedings. The Panel may extend a time period under this subsection; except that the total of all such extensions with respect to any application shall not exceed 90 days.

"(f) EFFECT OF APPROVAL.—A carrier or corporation participating in or resulting from a transaction approved by the Panel under this section, or exempted by the Panel from the application of this section pursuant to section 13541, may carry out the transaction, own and operate property, and exercise control or franchises acquired through the transaction without the approval of a State authority. A carrier, corporation, or person participating in the approved or exempted transaction is exempt from the anti-trust laws and from all other law, including State and municipal law, as necessary to let that person carry out the transaction, hold, maintain, and operate property, and exercise control or franchises acquired through the transaction.

"(g) LIMITATION ON APPLICABILITY.—This section shall not apply to transactions involving carriers whose aggregate gross operating revenues were not more than \$2,000,000 during a period of 12 consecutive months ending not more than 6 months before the date of the agreement of the parties.

Page 205, line 17, strike "two" and insert "2".

Page 206, line 12, strike "two" and insert "2".

Page 208, line 2, strike "performed" and all that follows through "without" on line 5 and insert "performed without".

Page 212, line 6, after "exceeds" insert a comma.

Page 218, line 7, strike "will be" and insert "is".

Page 218, line 12, strike "will minimize" and insert "minimizes".

Page 218, line 15, strike "will result" and insert "results".

Page 221, after line 12, insert the following: "(d) LIMITATION.—The Secretary and the Panel only have authority under this section with respect to matters within their respective jurisdictions under this part.

Page 222, lines 12 and 13, strike ", through its own attorneys."

Page 222, line 17, strike "of Transportation".

Page 222, lines 17 and 18, strike "Intermodal Surface Transportation" and insert "the".

Page 223, after line 2, insert the following: "(a) IN GENERAL.—

Page 223, line 3, strike "(a)" and insert "(1)".

Page 223, line 3, strike "ORDER" and insert "ORDER".

Page 223, move lines 3 through 9 two ems to the right.

Move the sentence beginning on line 4 of page 224 after the period on line 9 of page 223. Move paragraph (2) on lines 17 through 21 of page 223 after line 9 on page 223.

Page 223, strike lines 10 and 11 and insert the following:

"(b) LIABILITY AND DAMAGES FOR EXCEEDING TARIFF RATE.—

Page 223, move lines 12 through 16 two ems to the left.

Page 223, line 16, strike "of this title".

Page 223, line 26, strike "of this title".

Page 224, line 1, strike "(1) or (2) of this section".

Page 226, strike lines 10 through 14 and insert the following:

"(e) ATTORNEY'S FEES.—The district court shall award a reasonable attorney's fee under this section. The district court shall tax and collect that fee as part of the costs of the action.

Page 226, line 10, strike "

Page 227, line 6, strike "of this title".

Page 227, lines 13 and 14, strike "subsection (b)" and all that follows through "section" on line 15 and insert "subsections (b) and (c)".

Page 227, line 17, strike "of this section".

Page 229, line 12, strike "filed".

Page 229, line 12, strike "of this title."

Page 230, strike lines 18 through 24 and insert the following:

"(1) LIMITATION OF LIABILITY.—A carrier may limit liability imposed under subsection (a) by establishing rates for the transportation of property (other than household goods) under which the liability of the carrier for such property (A) is limited to a value established by written or electronic declaration of the shipper or by a mutual written agreement between the carrier and shipper, or (B) is contained in a schedule of rules and rates maintained by the carrier and provided to the shipper upon request. The schedule shall clearly state its dates of applicability.

Page 231, line 11, strike the parenthetical phrase.

Page 237, line 6, strike "In any case" and all that follows through the period on line 12 and insert the following:

The arbitrator may determine which party shall pay the cost or a portion of the cost of the arbitration proceeding.

Page 239, line 1, strike "motor".

Page 240, line 18, strike "those types of".

Page 240, after line 18, insert the following:

"(g) REVIEW BY SECRETARY.—Not later than 36 months after the effective date of this section, the Secretary shall complete a review of the dispute settlement program established under this section. If, after notice and opportunity for comment, the Secretary determines that changes are necessary to such program to ensure the fair and equitable resolution of disputes under this section, the Secretary shall implement such changes and transmit a report to Congress on such changes.

Page 241, line 4, after "with" insert "section 13702 or, with respect to transportation provided before the effective date of this section,".

Page 241, line 4, strike "of this title" and insert a comma.

Page 241, line 7, strike "filed".

Page 246, line 23, strike "subsection (a) or (b) of".

Page 248, line 6, strike "AGENTS AND OTHERS" and insert "OTHERS".

Page 249, line 4, after "person" insert a comma.

Page 252, line 9, after "registration" insert "of a foreign motor carrier or foreign motor private carrier".

Page 257, in the table of sections of subchapter II of chapter 7, strike the item relating to section 725 and redesignate the subsequent items accordingly.

Page 269, lines 16 through 25, strike section 725.

Page 270, lines 1 and 4, redesignate sections 726 and 727 as sections 725 and 726, respectively.

Page 271, line 2, after "Panel" insert "or the Secretary".

Page 271, line 3, after "Panel" insert "or the Secretary".

Page 271, line 3, strike "or times" and insert "and to such extent".

Page 271, line 24, insert "The Panel shall promptly rescind all regulations established by the Interstate Commerce Commission that are based on provisions of law repealed and not substantively reenacted by this Act." after "operation of law."

Page 277, after line 22, insert the following: (1) in section 5005(a)(4) by striking "5201(7)" and inserting "5201(6)";

Page 277, line 23, strike "(1)" and insert "(2)".

Page 278, line 1, strike "(2)" and insert "(3)".

Page 278, after line 5, insert the following: (B) in section 5201(2) by striking "a motor common carrier, or express carrier" and inserting "or a motor carrier";

(C) in section 5201(4)—

(i) by striking "common"; and

(ii) by striking "permit" and inserting "registration";

(D) in section 5201(5)—

(i) by striking "common" each place it appears;

(ii) by striking "10102(14)" and inserting "13102(11)"; and

(iii) by striking "certificate of public convenience and necessity" and inserting "registration";

(E) by striking paragraph (6);

(F) by redesignating paragraphs (7) and (8) as paragraphs (6) and (7), respectively;

(G) in section 5201(6), as so redesignated, by striking "certificate of public convenience and necessity" and inserting "certificate or registration";

Redesignate subsequent subparagraphs on page 278, accordingly.

Page 278, line 10, strike "(B)" and insert "(H)".

Page 278, lines 10 and 11, strike "paragraph," and all that follows through the semicolon on line 12 and insert the following: paragraph—

(i) by striking "Commission" and inserting "Panel"; and

(ii) by striking "motor common carrier" each place it appears and inserting "motor carrier";

Page 278, line 22, strike "and".

Page 279, line 2, strike the period and insert "; and".

Page 279, after line 2, insert the following:

(M) in section 5215(a) by striking "motor common carrier" and inserting "motor carrier".

Page 280, line 10, strike "Board" and insert "Panel".

Page 282, line 5, strike "Board" and insert "Panel".

Page 283, line 15, strike "board" and insert "Panel".

Page 291, line 1, before "part" insert "common carriers of passengers under".

Page 291, line 3, before "part" insert "carriers of passengers under".

Page 291, line 9, strike "11501(g)(2)" and insert "14501(b)(2)".

H.R. 2564

OFFERED BY: MR. TRAFICANT

AMENDMENT NO. 1: Page 36, line 11, strike "AMENDMENT" and insert "AMENDMENTS", in line 13 insert "(a) REPORTS," before "Strike" and insert after line 21 the following:

(b) DEFINITIONS.—

(1) AGENT OF A FOREIGN PRINCIPAL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 1(c) of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (22 U.S.C. 611(c)), is amended—

(i) by striking "agent of a foreign principal" each place it appears and inserting "representative of a foreign principal";

(ii) in paragraph (1)(iv), by striking "and" after the semicolon at the end;

(iii) in paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end and inserting "; and"; and

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

"(3) any person who engages in political activities for purposes of furthering commercial, industrial, or financial operations with a foreign principal.

For purposes of clause (1), a foreign principal shall be considered to control a person in major part if the foreign principal holds more than 50 percent equitable ownership in such person or, subject to rebuttal evidence, if the foreign principal holds at least 20 percent but not more than 50 percent equitable ownership in such person."

(B) FURTHER DEFINITION.—Section 1(d) of that Act (22 U.S.C. 611(d)) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) The term 'representative of a foreign principal' does not include—

"(1) any news or press service or association organized under the laws of the United States or of any State or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, or any newspaper, magazine, periodical, or other publication for which there is on file with the United States Postal Service information in compliance with section 3685 of title 39, United States Code, published in the United States, solely by virtue of any bona fide news or journalistic activities, including the solicitation or acceptance of advertisements, subscriptions, or other compensation therefor, so long as it is at least 80 percent beneficially owned by, and its officers and directors, if any, are citizens of the United States, and such news or press service or association, newspaper magazine, periodical, or other publication, is not owned, directed, supervised, controlled, subsidized, or financed, and none of its policies are determined by any foreign principal defined in subsection (b) of this section, or by any representative of a foreign principal required to register under this Act; or

"(2) any incorporated, nonprofit membership organization organized under the laws of the United States or of any State or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States that is registered under section 308 of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act

and has obtained tax-exempt status under section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and whose activities are directly supervised, directed, controlled, financed, or subsidized in whole by citizens of the United States."

(2) POLITICAL PROMOTIONAL OR INFORMATIONAL MATERIALS.—Section 1(j) of that Act (22 U.S.C. 611(j)) is amended—

(A) in the matter preceding clause (1), by striking "propaganda" and inserting "promotional or informational materials"; and

(B) in clause (1), by striking "prevail upon, indoctrinate, convert, induce, or in any other way" and inserting "in any way".

(3) POLITICAL ACTIVITIES.—Section 1(o) of that Act (22 U.S.C. 611(o)) is amended—

(A) by striking "prevail upon, indoctrinate, convert, induce, persuade, or in any other way" and inserting "in any way"; and

(B) by striking "or changing the domestic or foreign" and inserting "enforcing, or changing the domestic or foreign laws, regulations, or".

(4) POLITICAL CONSULTANT.—Section 1(p) of that Act (22 U.S.C. 611(p)) is amended—

(A) by inserting "(1)" after "any person"; and

(B) by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: ", or (2) who distributes political promotional or informational materials to an officer or employee of the United States Government, in his or her capacity as such officer or employee".

(5) SERVING PREDOMINANTLY A FOREIGN INTEREST.—Section 1(q) of that Act (22 U.S.C. 611(q)) is amended—

(A) by striking "and" at the end of clause (i) of the proviso; and

(B) by inserting before the period at the end the following: ", and (iv) such activities do not involve the representation of the interests of the foreign principal before any agency or official of the Government of the United States other than providing information in response to requests by such agency or official or as a necessary part of a formal judicial or administrative proceeding, including the initiation of such a proceeding."

(c) SUPPLEMENTAL REGISTRATION.—Section 2(b) of that Act (22 U.S.C. 612(b)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence by striking ", within thirty days" and all that follows through "preceding six months' period" and inserting "on January 31 and July 31 of each year file with the Attorney General a supplement thereto under oath, on a form prescribed by the Attorney General, which shall set forth regarding the six-month periods ending the previous December 31, and June 30, respectively, or, if a lesser period, the period since the initial filing,"; and

(2) by inserting after the first sentence the following new sentence: "Any registrant using an accounting system with a fiscal year which is different from the calendar year may petition the Attorney General to permit the filing of supplemental statements at the close of the first and seventh month of each such fiscal year in lieu of the dates specified by the preceding sentence."

(d) REMOVAL OF EXEMPTION FOR CERTAIN COUNTRIES.—Section 3(f) of that Act (22 U.S.C. 613(f)) is repealed.

(e) LIMITING EXEMPTION FOR LEGAL REPRESENTATION.—Section 3(g) of that Act (22 U.S.C. 613(g)) is amended by striking "or any agency of the Government of the United States" and all that follows through "informal" and inserting "or before the Patent and Trademark Office, including any written submission to that Office".

(f) NOTIFICATION OF RELIANCE ON EXEMPTIONS.—Section 3 of that Act (22 U.S.C. 613) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"Any person who does not register under section 2(a) on account of any provision of subsections (a) through (g) of this section shall so notify the Attorney General in such form and manner as the Attorney General prescribes."

(g) CIVIL PENALTIES AND ENFORCEMENT PROVISIONS.—Section 8 of that Act (22 U.S.C. 618) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(i)(1) Any person who is determined, after notice and opportunity for an administrative hearing—

"(A) to have failed to file when such filing is required a registration statement under section 2(a) or a supplement thereto under section 2(b),

"(B) to have omitted a material fact required to be stated therein, or

"(C) to have made a false statement with respect to such a material fact,

shall be required to pay for each violation committed a civil penalty of not less than \$2,000 and not more than \$1,000,000. In determining the amount of the penalty, the Attorney General shall give due consideration to the nature and duration of the violation.

"(2)(A) Whenever the Attorney General has reason to believe that any person may be in possession, custody, or control of any documentary material relevant to an investigation regarding any violation of paragraph (1) of this subsection or of section 5, the Attorney General may, before bringing any civil or criminal proceeding thereon, issue in writing, and cause to be served upon such person, a civil investigative demand requiring such person to produce such material for examination.

"(B) Civil investigative demands issued under this paragraph shall be subject to the applicable provisions of section 1968 of title 18, United States Code."

(h) CHANGE IN SHORT TITLE OF THE ACT.—Section 14 of that Act (22 U.S.C. 611 note) is amended by striking "Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended" and inserting "Foreign Interests Representation Act".

(i) REFERENCES TO AGENT OF A FOREIGN PRINCIPAL.—The Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended is amended—

(1) by striking "agent of a foreign principal" each place it appears and inserting "representative of a foreign principal";

(2) by striking "agents of foreign principals" each place it appears and inserting "representatives of foreign principals";

(3) by striking "agent of such principal" each place it appears and inserting "representative of such principal"; and

(4) by striking "such agent" each place it appears and inserting "such representative".

(j) REFERENCES TO POLITICAL PROPAGANDA.—

(1) The paragraph preceding section 1 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended is amended by striking "propaganda" and inserting "political".

(2) The Foreign Interests Representation Act (other than the paragraph amended by paragraph (1) of this subsection) is amended by striking "propaganda" each place it appears and inserting "promotional or informational materials".

(k) REFERENCES TO THE ACT.—

(1) Section 207(f)(2) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking "Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended," and inserting "Foreign Interests Representation Act".



(2) Section 219 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(C), in subsection (a) by striking "agent of a foreign principal required to register under the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended," and inserting "representative of a foreign principal required to register under the Foreign Interests Representation Act"; and

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) by striking "agent of a foreign principal" and inserting "representative of a foreign principal";

(ii) by striking "such agent" and inserting "such representative"; and

(iii) by striking "Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended" and inserting "Foreign Interests Representation Act".

(3) Section 5210(4) of the Competitiveness Policy Council Act (15 U.S.C. 4809(4)) is amended—

(A) by striking "agent of a foreign principal" and inserting "representative of a foreign principal"; and

(B) by striking "subsection (d) of the first section of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 (22 U.S.C. 611)" and inserting "section 1(d) of the Foreign Interests Representation Act (22 U.S.C. 611(d))".

(4) Section 34(a) of the Trading With the Enemy Act (50 U.S.C. App. 34(a)) is amended by striking "Act of June 8, 1934 (ch. 327, 52 Stat. 631), as amended" and inserting "Foreign Interests Representation Act".